

Mr. Speaker: They are circulated separately.

Shri Tenneti Viswamatham: They are not to do it. When was the Ordinance placed on the Table?

Mr. Speaker: After it was laid on the Table it was circulated. Please search for it.

Shri Nethi Pal: We will take it up later on?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri J. Mohamed Imam (Chitradurga): Sir, you were pleased to announce the business for the rest of the day. What about the business for the rest of the week? Has it been settled?

Mr. Speaker: We are in the middle of the Motion of No-confidence. Let us proceed with it.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN
THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—
contd.

Mr. Speaker: Before we proceed with the Motion of No-confidence, I would like to announce the timings. The Home Minister will speak at 15.00 hours, the Prime Minister at 15.45 hours and Shri Vajpayee will reply to the debate at 16.10 hours. The Motion will then be put to vote at 16.25 hours. Then, naturally, we will have to adjourn and the General Budget will be presented at 17.00 hours.

Now, Dr. Lohia has already taken about 22 to 23 minutes. He may kindly conclude his speech in another couple of minutes.

श्री मधु लिमबे (मुंगेर) : हमारे दल की तरफ से और कोई नहीं बोलेंगा, पूरा समय उनको दे दिया जाये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कलकत्ता) : काँग्रेस वालों ने 15 मिनट समय ले लिया था, उसको न जोड़ा जाय।

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, I had written you a letter under Rule 377. I have not heard from you whether you have been pleased to allow me to raise the matter. I regard the matter to be one of extreme importance.

Mr. Speaker: I have given my consideration to it.

Shri K. Lakkappa (Tumkur): Sir, I rise to a point of order relating to procedure. At the outset, I would like to make myself clear. I am not questioning the authority of the Speaker but I am only raising a point of procedure. I am only saying that on this Motion of No-confidence the procedure that has been followed is not in order. It is said here that after leave is granted under sub-rule (2) the Speaker may after considering the list of business in the House allot a day or days for discussion. My submission is that Saturday, the day on which leave was granted should not be counted because the next sub-rule says: "At the appointed hour on the allotted day..." Therefore, my submission is that the day on which it is admitted cannot be considered as the "allotted day" and a subsequent day has to be fixed. I am only submitting that the day on which the motion was admitted should not be counted, that day should be counted in favour of the Opposition and one more day should be allotted for this debate.

Mr. Speaker: Let us proceed—Dr. Lohia.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सम्मेलन मजबूत, कलकत्ता की कलनी बटा वारे क्षेत्र पर लगी हुई है और कलनी का खरी है। खरीलिये कीने और मुल केके कीनी के बडा चर कीनीनी केकम और किमुल बडी का ब्रवात ब्रवात। इस समय बहु तरफर और ब्रवात की ब्रवात

अफ़सना के संबंध में क्या कर रही हैं और राजस्थान हीं चारों ओर कहीं, विद्यमान एक कक्ष के कि भारत की सरकार विदेशों के और खास तौर से अमरीका से भीख मांगे और प्रदेश की सरकार भारत की सरकार से पैसा मांगे और खून मांगे इनके अलावा और कुछ नहीं हो रहा है। अमेरिका का एक विधायक जो यहां आया था तहकीकात करने इन लोगों को धन दिया जाय या नहीं उसने अमेरिका लौट कर कहा है कि भारत दान और भीख का मांगता है, मांगता रहता है। यह उसने कहा है। भारत के आत्म सम्मान बगैरा का सवाल मैं उठाना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि माननीय मंत्री-मंडल को सम्मान का तो कुछ पता ही नहीं है। लेकिन यह मैं जरूर कहना चाहता हूं कि इस आधार पर कि लगातार भीख मांगते चले जाओ और जो आदत भारत सरकार ने सीख ली है अमेरिका या और किसी देश से भीख मांगने की वही आदत प्रदेश की सरकारों ने सीख ली है, धाते हैं, यहां मिलते हैं प्रधान मन्त्री से और न जाने कौन कौन मन्त्रियों से किस बात पर? हमको धन दो, हमको पैसा दो। और कुछ नहीं। यह नहीं कि हम को ऐसा इन्तजाम करना है कि जिससे चार या छः हफ्ते में हम लाखों टन, पचास लाख या 60 लाख टन की तादाद में अनाज अपने देश में पैदा कर लें।

उसके लिये सिंचाई का हमको इन्तजाम करना है। उसके लिये टाट और बिरला बगैरा खिलने भी मशीनें पैदा करने वाले सस्थान हैं, उनके लिए नियम बनाना है कि सिंचाई के अलावा और कोई मशीन अब नहीं बना सकते। सारे देश के मन को उठा देना है, अकरकन्धी, आलू जो कुछ भी पैदा हो सकता है उसे पैदा करना है ताकि भूख लोग मरें नहीं, लेकिन यह सब इन की समझ में नहीं आयेगा, क्योंकि धाज ठो क्लिन-मस्त्रका, रक्त पिपासनी अकाल अन्धिका का पूरा सा आच्छा सारे देश में हो रहा है, ये सारी बातें समझ में कैसे आयेगी।

यही लिए मैं अब से और से कहना चाहता हूं कि हमें इस समय प्रदेशों में और केन्द्र में

ऐसी नीति प्रणयानी चाहिये कि जिससे सारी जनता कामचोर न रहे। इस समय सब लोग कामचोर हो गये हैं, मंत्रियों से लगाकर साधारण जनता तक, मैं अपने को उससे बाहर नहीं करता हूं

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप भी शामिल हैं।

डा० राज मनोहर लोहिया : मैं भी कामचोर हो जाता, लेकिन क्या कर्क आपके चेहरों को देख कर बोडी बहुत मेहनत करनी पडती है। काम चोरी के मतलब होते हैं—सिबाय चापलूसी, चुगलखोरी और रिश्तेदारी, इन तीन गुणों के प्रतिरिक्त और कोई गुण तरक्की और दौलत के लिये यहां पर जरूरी नहीं समझे जाते। अब यह युग बदलना चाहिये, मेहनत का युग और अनुशासन का आरम्भ होना चाहिये, लेकिन इस सरकार के बसकी वह चीज नहीं है, क्योंकि पिछले 20 वर्षों से इसने केवल रिश्तेदारी, चुगलखोरी और चापलूसी का युग चला रखा है।

अब, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे आप केवल पांच मिनट दे दीजिये, सारी बातें खत्म हो जायेगी। इस लिये एक चीज ध्यान में रखनी होगी, ऐसा न समझे कि यह सरकार बहुत ज्यादा दिन चल जायेगी। बहुत से लोग समझते हैं कि साल, दो साल में साधारण चुनाव होंगे, कोई जरूरी नहीं है—साधारण चुनाव, क्योंकि मैं यह समझता हूं कि जो हरियाणा और पुडुचेरी में हो रहा है, वह यहां पर भी होकर रहेगा, खाली उधर के 25 प्रादमियों को उधर धरने की जरूरत है, खाली 25 प्रादमियों के धरने से सारा मामला बदल जायेगा और मैं इस संबंध में कहना चाहता हूं कि जनसंघ और कम्युनिस्ट वाले जो हमेशा अपने सिद्धांतों को अपने चेहरे और बांह पर लेकर चला करते हैं, उन्हें एक दफा हमको ब्रीक लिज मझ गही पर बैठने के लिये, सारे के सारे सिद्धांत सब ठीक-ठाक हो जायेंगे, हालांकि धाज मेरे लहने के नहीं हो रहे हैं। लेकिन यहां यही सामने आई, सब एक हो जायेंगे।

‘दा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]’

इसलिये, अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप याद रखें, मैंने हीरा, पन्ना अथवा मिक कोट का सवाल उठाया, तो केवल इन इरादे से कि भारत की एक प्रतिशत जनता भारत की सालाना आमदनी का 35 प्रतिशत से 50 प्रतिशत खा जाया करती है, यानी 50 लाख आदमी 15 सैकड़ा अथवा 50 सैकड़ा से मतलब होगा करीब 50 अरब से लेकर 70 अरब— ये लोग खा जाया करते हैं। इसलिये इनके खर्च पर, इनकी बुनियाधी और विशेष सुविधाओं पर एक रोक लगाना चाहता हूँ। मुझे बार बार टोक दिया जाता है कि तुम आरोप लगाने हो

एक आननीय सभ्य अध्यक्ष महोदय, ये 5 हजार रुपये कहा से खर्च करते हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया प्रधान मंत्री ने सफाई दी है कि ये हार और मिक कोट पाया करती है। यह मिक कोट इन को न इनके पिता ने दिया, ना दादा ने दिया, बल्कि परदेसी सरकार ने दिया है। ऐसी स्थिति में जरूरी हो जाता है कि खर्च पर रोक लगाई जाय (व्यवधान)

Mr. Speaker: Shri Randhir Singh Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak) Mr Speaker, I am stunned by the performance and by the drama of Dr Ram Manohar Lohia I know Dr. Lohia by inches (Interruptions) I will not allow him to speak I can not be shouted down I have been allowed by the Speaker to speak (Interruptions) I cannot be cowed down by him or others. I know him fully.

बर का भेदी लता डायें।

.... (Interruptions) I know all of them fully (Interruptions) I will not sit down Why should I? I have been allowed by the Speaker. Let others sit down ... (interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I would request all the hon. Members, including Shri Randhir, to sit down. So many hon. Members should not speak at the

same time. Hon. Members should not lose their tempers.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरा एक वाक्य है, जिसको पूरा कर लें दीजिये।

Mr. Speaker: I have allowed Dr. Lohia so much of time, in fact twice of what other Members have got.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया केन्स एक वाक्य (Interruptions)

Mr Speaker: I would request both Shri Randhir Singh and Dr Lohia to take their seats I have given Dr Lohia the maximum time I have given to anybody

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया खातिलकर साहब ने एकमर और उन के जैसे दूसरे लोगो ने भी कहा है कि वह एक पार्टी है, एक मत है, हम लोग अनेक मत के है, यह बात सही है। अब रयँ मैंसे एक मत के है

Shri Randhir Singh: When I am allowed by the Speaker to speak, why should he speak?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया सारे एक मत है कि देश की दोलन में मे जितना ज्यादा बड़ा हिस्सा खा सको और बटार सको, कर लो, इस के अलावा और कोई एक मत नहीं है।

Shri Randhir Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have had the privilege of knowing Dr Lohia fully very closely and that too for a long time Dr Lohia is a full drama in himself I know him very closely, because I had the privilege of being with him for ten years in his own party

श्री जार्ज करनेवीस (बम्बई-दक्षिण) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपका नाम नहीं बताया।

Shri Randhir Singh: I watched his performance day before yesterday and even today. It is a matter of shame to me, because I always held him in very high esteem. To me, I must confess, till day before yesterday he was a leader, a scholar, a

philosopher and a guide. But, I confess with regret, from today he is nothing; he is less than a lay man.

श्री रामसेवक दास (बाराबांकी) :
वे चापलूसी के प्रवर्तार हैं ।

An hon. Member: Is it a no-confidence motion against Dr. Lohia?

Shri Randhir Singh: I must say that I was very much stunned by the performance of my hon. friend from the side opposite. He attacked the very pride, the very soul of our nation, our proud, beloved and great Prime Minister the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, *jawahar*, the most precious jewel of our country and the beloved son of our motherland. I must say that 10,000 Lohias and 20,000 Randhir Singhs are born every day in this country, but Jawaharlal Nehru is borne only once in thousands and thousands of years. It is a matter of shame that small fries like him try and launch a tirade of vilification and campaign of character assassination against one who had been the king-emperor of 500 million hearts of our countrymen.... (interruptions).

13 hrs.

Not only do I say this but this was said by an eminent foreign author, Dr. John Gunther, in his eminent book, *Inside Asia*. If Dr. Lohia wants to read that book, he should have a copy and read this. Then he will scan the stature of that greatest son of our country, the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

He again committed a mistake in this august House when he made a reference, a rubbish reference, about the great Nehru family. I know it for certain that the whole nation, the whole motherland, is indebted, and profoundly indebted, to this illustrious family.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Randhir Singh: If I am permitted to say, through you, to the great doctor . . . (Interruptions). Kindly hear me. Never in the domain of human history was so much owed by so many to so few. The nation owes so much to the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru . . . (Interruption).

एक माननीय सदस्य . माननीय सदस्य यह चाटुकारिता हमें सुनाने आये है या यह भविष्यवाणी प्रस्ताव पर बोलने आये हैं ?

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) :
भविष्यवाणी प्रस्ताव पर बोलिये । इस तरह से चापलूसी पर यज्ञ नहीं बोलिये । भविष्यवाणी प्रस्ताव पर बोलिये ।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Randhir Singh may kindly resume his seat. All must sit down . . . (Interruption). Please have a little patience. If the Opposition has a right to say what they want to say and think is very important, kindly permit them also to say what they like within the time allotted to them. If you go on shouting and do not allow them to speak, it is not proper. Both sides must hear what the other side has to say. Time is allotted to each of them. You speak what you think is important and they speak what they think is important; but kindly do allow them to speak. I do not want these interruptions.... (Interruption).

श्री रामसेवक दास : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

Shri Tulshidas Jadhav (Baramati): Under which rule is he raising a point of order?

An hon. Member: Under what rule?

श्री रामसेवक दास : अध्यक्ष महोदय, भारत एक गणतन्त्र है और प्रजातन्त्र चलता है । हमारे देश के संविधान में डाइनेस्टी का जिक्र, राजतन्त्र और बादशाह आदि की बात नहीं हो सकती है.... (शब्द ब न)

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri Randhir Singh: Sir, I was quoting a very eminent man of the world, Sir Winston Churchill. He, as Prime Minister of Great Britain, said on the floor of the House of Commons during World War II about the fighter pilots of the RAF, "Never in the domain of human history was so much owed by so many to so few." This, I say, is aptly proper about the Nehru dynasty.... (Interruption). Kindly allow me to proceed. In my heart it is a dynasty. Do not bother about that. Even dynasties are very good because it is a dynasty of the people and not of a coterie of people; it is not dictatorship. It is a democracy. If I use the word "dynasty", I use it as a very dignified and respectful term. I made that quotation for the great Nehru family.

Now, a reference was made by Dr. Lohia about our Prime Minister. Dr. Lohia won the election only by a margin of 400 votes. Our esteemed Prime Minister defeated his party-man by more than 100,000 votes. According to me, my esteemed leader, our Prime Minister, defeated 250 Dr. Lohias put together. He was elected by a margin of 400 votes and my leader was elected by a margin of 100,000 votes.

Secondly, Dr. Lohia, kindly permit me to say, is a baron when he is residing; he is a duke when he is moving and he is a lord when he is speaking. I know that about Dr. Lohia. He is living in a palatial building and his monthly budget comes to about Rs. 4,000 or Rs. 5,000.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member's time is up now.

Shri Randhir Singh: I want to say something about Rajasthan also.

An hon. Member: He must be given time.

Mr. Speaker: He should resume his seat. Shrimati Gayatri Devi,

Shri Randhir Singh: Kindly allow me.

Mr. Speaker: I have called the next speaker.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

Shri Randhir Singh: My leader is the Prime Minister; my leader is the Deputy Prime Minister, my leader is the Home Minister; so, I am the Prime Minister, I am the Deputy Prime Minister and I am the Home Minister.... (Interruption).

Shri Nath Pal: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Speaker, who was in possession of the floor, explained himself later on but nonetheless spoke of a dynasty. May I draw your attention to the fact that the Constitution of India begins with this sentence:—

"We the people of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a Sovereign Democratic Republic."

There is no scope for any dynasty, howsoever beloved it may be. Dr. Lohia said later on, "One of Allahabad and another of Jaipur". We are not going to have any dynasty in this country, either for Jaipur or for Allahabad.... (Interruption).

Shrimati Gayatri Devi (Jaipur): Sir, I rise to support the No-Confidence motion that has been moved on Government's decision to impose President's rule in Rajasthan. I was not quite clear what the speaker before me was talking about, but he seemed to have been speaking on a no-confidence motion against Dr. Lohia and completely missed the point of the No-Confidence motion.

I would like to point out to you that the results of the General Elections in Rajasthan show clearly that the Congress was defeated. They secured 49 seats of the 104 and the rest 55 went to the Opposition. In 1952 and in 1957 as well the Congress in Rajasthan got only 49 per cent of

the votes or so, but at that time the Opposition did not unite, as they have done this time. This time, as soon as the elections were over, the Leader of the Swatantra Party, the Leader of the Jana Sangh, the Leader of the Socialist Party, the Leader of the Janta Party and the independents that were returned all got together and decided to form themselves into what they called the Samyukta Dal. They elected their leader and made a 15-point programme. When the one Communist, who was returned to the Vidhan Sabha in Rajasthan, saw the programme, he also decided that he could easily support the Samyukta Dal. Therefore he decided to join us. Therefore, there was no question about our not having the majority.

After the Samyukta Dal was formed and the leader was chosen, the Leader of the Samyukta Dal, Maharawal Lakshman Singh, wrote a letter to the Rajyapal telling him about the Samyukta Dal, explaining about our majority and asking him if he could be invited to form the Government. At that point, the Governor sought certain clarifications. All that was furnished to him. I have with me the correspondence between the leader of the Samyukta Dal and the Governor of Rajasthan.

Shri Pileo Mody (Godhra): Please ask her to put it on the Table of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Not necessary.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: All the correspondence is here.

Mr. Speaker: Let her continue her speech.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: I hope, Sir, you will not mind if I just read some extracts of what they had written to the Governor.

On the 24th of February, 1967, the leaders of the Rajasthan Swatantra Party, the Jana Sangh Party, the

Samyukta Socialist Party, the Janta Party and the Independent Members wrote to the Governor telling him the results of the 1967 General Elections which had shown that the Congress Party had only secured 88 seats, one Member of the Congress Party having won two seats of Malpura and Tonk constituencies and that the people had shown want of confidence in the Government to rule in Rajasthan. The Congress Party was in a clear minority while the Opposition Members who had joined together had a clear majority. He also informed the Rajyapal that the Swatantra Party, the Jana Sangh party, the S.S.P., the Janta Party and others had decided to form the Government on the basis of their majority.

As I said earlier, the Governor sought certain clarifications to which the leader of the Samyukta Dal replied and he gave the break-up as follows:

Swatantra Party	49 seats
Jana Sangh	22 seats
Samyukta Socialist Party	8 seats
Janta Party and other	
Independents	13 seats
Community Party of India	1 seat
	<hr/>
Total	93 seats
	<hr/>

As I said before, we earlier had 95 seats all together. While one of our Swatantra Party M.L.As who was elected to the Vidhan Sabha was celebrating his victory, some police cars came and picked him up and took him away. Since then, none of us has seen him.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: I would like to tell you the number, of the cars and the names of the police personnel who were responsible for kidnapping him while he was celebrating his victory. I shall come to that later.

In the meanwhile, Dr. Sampurnanad replied to Maharawal Lakshman Singh

[Shrimati Gayatri Devi]

on the 27th February saying that he was not still quite clear as to the picture that was emerging and he also sought a clarification as to which non-Congress men who have been elected to Vidhan Sabha have joined the Samyukta Dal. The Governor, in his letter to Maharawal Lakshman Singh, pointed out that 13 Members who had been elected as Independents were not clear and the Governor went on to say that he was not sure whether the Communist Member elected to the Vidhan Sabha was with the Opposition. On the 28th February, 1967, the leader of the Opposition, Maharawal Lakshman Singh, replied to him, telling him about the membership of the Opposition which I just read out and also told him that the Communist Member was willing to support the Opposition and that an intimation to that effect had already been sent to him by the Secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. H. K. Vyas.

At that point, it was quite clear that we had 93 Members and we were capable of forming the Government. We gave this information to the Governor and on the 2nd March we wrote to the Governor, telling him that Maharawal Lakshman Singh had been elected as the leader of the Samyakta Dal. We had given a 15 point programme and we told him that we were able to form the Government of Rajasthan. At that time, Dr. Sampurnanand listened to us in patience and he asked some questions and we told him different things. In the meanwhile, the Congress Party had been misleading him, telling him that certain Independents had told them that they would remain with the Congress and not with the Samyukta Dal. One Independent Member was produced before the Governor and the Governor was told that he was with us. They did not help the dissident Congress M.L.As to join the Samyukta Dal. On this point, I may also point out that after the elections, Shri Kamraj, the Congress President, had

said that no dissident Congress Member would be allowed to join the Congress Party if he had won election as an Independent. Here, I may mention that one of the M.L.As from Alwar...

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj: That is our internal problem.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: It may be your internal problem but it is also the problem of Rajasthan. The people have voted against the Congress. You have installed President's rule because you cannot form a majority. Shri Abdul Haji was not given a Congress ticket. He was arrested under the Defence of India Rules during our trouble with Pakistan. But when the Congress found that they had not emerged in a clear majority, this gentleman was allowed to be counted with the Congress Party. Another dissident Congressman, from Falodi constituency was allowed to join the Congress Party.

-So, on the 2nd March, the position was that we were 93 and the Congress 91. On the 3rd March, the Governor was due to announce his decision as to whom he would inform to form the Government. When we went to him in the morning, he said that it was very difficult for him to judge who was on which side and that people seem to be crossing the floor all the time. We were also accused by the Congress of having a camp where, it was said we had detained our M.L.As. I should like to point out that this camp was certainly ours. To begin with, the Swatantra Party M.L.As. used it as a place of residence and then the Jana Sangh Party M.L.As. also wanted to use it, and then came the S.S.P. M.L.As. and also the Independents. This camp was about 12 miles outside Jaipur. The Members were absolutely free to go anywhere they liked. As I told you before, Shri Samrath Rai has not been seen since the day he was picked up. It is learnt that he is in the house of some former Rajasthan Minister. We also know that some other M.L.As.

some of their relations have been threatened in certain former Rajasthan Ministers' houses. Because the police officials were on the side of the Congress Party, some false warrants were issued against some of our people and they were brought before the magistrates and they were prevented from moving freely.

All this went on before 2nd March because we had won a clear majority. They had only 88 members and they started breaking them away from us. On the 3rd March, the leader of the Samyukta Dal, along with the Communist Member, went to meet the Rajyapal and he assured them that he would give a fair decision. But he was a little bit surprised when he found that the Communist Member was with us. He was a little bit surprised because he was given to understand that the Communist Party would not support the Samyukta Dal. Now when Dr Sampurnanand suddenly found that we had a clear majority he did not know what to do. He had to take a final decision. So he made some lame excuse that one of the Members of the Samyukta Dal had said something to him which he had never heard before. The remark was an ordinary one. As he left one of our Independent members said 'I hope your decision will be impartial and fair'. For an eminent person like Dr Sampurnanand to take offence at a remark like this, shows that he is not fit to be the Governor of a big border State like Rajasthan. It shows that a little thing like that could upset him. Anyway, it is not true to say that he had never heard such things before. If we just look back, we will remember that once when he went to address the Rajasthan Assembly, he was not allowed to speak. He had seen worse things as compared to a remark like that.

Anyhow, that was the 3rd of March. All the leaders of the Samyukta Dal and others had assembled at my residence and we waited anxiously for the decision of the Rajyapal. The press arrived there and told us that the decision had been postponed by one day

because of that unfortunate remark. All right, we bowed to that decision and we waited for the 4th morning. On the evening of the 3rd March, people in Jaipur and all of us were very astounded to hear that section 144 had suddenly been imposed from the 4th morning in the residential areas where the Rajyapal and the Ministers lived. We could not understand why this precaution had been taken, and whether it had something to do with the Governor's decision. If it was just as a precautionary measure then since he was due to make his announcement on the 3rd March, why should he have waited till the 4th morning and why was section 144 not imposed on that day itself? Furthermore it shows that it was done with the connivance of the Central Government and the Home Minister. Here because the police had come in from UP and Madhya Pradesh and this could not have happened without the co-operation of the Central Home Ministry. Now I would like to ask, as I have already asked why this precaution had not been taken on the 3rd itself.

This naturally made everybody in Rajasthan and particularly all of us of the Samyukta Dal very suspicious. We also realised that whatever his decision was going to be on the 4th March was going to be an unpopular one and that was why all these precautions had been taken. If it had not been an unfortunate one and it was just an ordinary precaution, then section 144 should have been imposed all over the city but it was imposed only in the residential areas just to protect the Rajyapal and the Ministers living there.

Anyhow came the 4th March and came this momentous decision of the Rajyapal that he had asked Shri Mohanlal Sukhadia to form the Government because the Congress Party was the single largest party elected to the Rajasthan Vidhan Sabha and he could not count the Independents because they had no programme. But

[Shrimati Gayatri Devi]

what about the 15th lakh voters who had voted for them? Again, what about their vote in the Assembly? Was that not going to count either?

Never mind, if that was the Rajyapal's decision, we were all willing to abide by it. But why did he have to wait till the 4th March to make this decision? The results of the elections were out on the 20th February, and 28th February was the day when he should have called the Assembly. Why did he not do that? Why was he playing for time? Who was stopping it? who was conspiring for Shri Mohanlal Sukhadia to buy over other MLAs. Just think of that? If that was the wonderful decision that he was going to take, why should he have waited? Why should he have not done it on the 20th February itself when he knew what the results of the Rajasthan elections were? However, be that as it was, naturally, as you can imagine, we were very annoyed, and we were very irritated and we were very furious at this unfair decision. We decided that evening to hold a meeting in the Manik Chaupar where the 92 MLAs....

Shri Mohammad Yunus Saleem (Nalgonda): On a point order

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Under what rule? What rule has been infringed?

Shri Mohammad Yunus Saleem: Under sub-rule 5 of rule 108. I presume that you have been pleased to allot some time for every speaker. Just now when Shri Randhir Singh was on his legs, you stopped him from proceeding further because the time prescribed by you was over.

Shri Nath Pai: It is an ungentlemanly interruption. He may be asked to sit down.

Mr. Speaker: I am aware of that. The hon. Member may resume his seat.

Shri Mohammad Yunus Saleem: I would beg of you to prescribe some time-limit for every speaker. Otherwise, there will be no limit to it.

Mr. Speaker: I am aware of that.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Surely, the hon. Member who is speaking is entitled to all the time that my party is entitled to. I am afraid the hon. Member does not know the rules.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. lady Member may try to conclude.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: I am trying to conclude. But if he takes away half of my time what can I do? I am not going to take more time than the Congress Members.

As I said, we decided to hold this meeting at the Manik Chaupar and present our 92 MLAs to the people. Anyhow, at that meeting, it was obvious that the people were behind us and when we announced that we were going the next day to see the Rajyapal and five of our leaders would go and ask him to revoke this decision, the people said that they would like to come along with us at that point, I pleaded with them not to break section 144 they; they promised me that they would not, but they said that it was their right to demonstrate against the unfortunate decision, that for the last ten years they had been trying to get rid of the Congress Government but because the Opposition had not been united they had not been able to do it and this was the first time that they had been united and had an opportunity and therefore, they wished to go along with us.

On the 5th morning, I went early in the morning to Manik Chaupar. All

the people were gathered there. I told them 'Section 144 dhara lagoo hai; but you must not break it. They promised too. Everything went off peacefully and in the ordinary fashion they marched near the Civil Lines. When they approached the point where section 144 had been imposed, the police in the presence of the IGP and the Collector allowed them to cross the line; they went another full half a mile; the people as well as the leaders went; then, the leaders were trying to get into a jeep in order to go and see the Rajyapal. But they were prevented and they were taken and put into a police vehicle and arrested. The people then found themselves without the leaders. They did not know where to go. They began to wander about. And suddenly, without any warning, they were tear-gassed and they were lathi-charged and they ran into the residential areas. They jumped into the compounds; they jumped into our compounds, my daughter's compound, my brother-in-law's compound etc. they went inside all these houses to seek refuge. If you are in a private house, then section 144 does not apply. But the police in their excess and in their madness jumped into these houses and pulled the servants out of the servants' quarters, and beat these people up. One of my nephews said to the police 'Aap Jayiye' and they said 'Yahan se unko hataa deejaiye'; they were in the verandha. He said *Haat jodkor 'Unse baad mem kahoonga; lekin ab to aap nikal jaiye'*. At that point, the police started and they sat upon him, and seven policemen beat this nephew of mine and then he said that his head had been cut open as a result of it. After all this was over, many people were arrested. I would like to tell you that they were arrested and they were taken away and put in jails and they were taken to hospitals. And this wonderful care-taker Government of ours did not even care to publish the list so that the mothers and fathers and children could know where their relations were. I found a little boy who had

been in jail for three days. His parents had not been informed; he was just nine years old. On the first day he had been taken to the *Kotwali* and beaten up by the police there and I could come to know of it only after three days, after he had got into the Central jail. It was only then that I could discover that he had been in jail for three days. I had been there to see the Opposition leaders and I asked for permission to see the others in jail also but I was refused permission. I told them that I was their elected Member of Parliament and they were in my constituency and therefore, surely I had the right to see them, and see whether all was well. But I was refused permission. As I was leaving, I saw a little child at the gate; he was sobbing his heart out. I told the jailor 'I refuse to listen to you; I am going to see the child'. He sobbed and he told me the story, and he gave me his name also and then I informed his house. He told me that he had been beaten up by the police and two days later he had been transferred to that jail. This was one child which I saw, but there are many more children under twelve also in the jail.

Here, I would also like to tell you that at that time the care-taker Government, this wonderful Government which is ruling us now under the name of President's rule, did not even have the sense of humanity, as I said, to publish the names of those who have died, those who were arrested and those who were missing; there are still about 11 to 12 people missing, and there is no trace of them, and people are wondering where they are.

Anyhow, all this happened on the 5th March. On the 6th morning, I came here. I pleaded with the President and I pleaded with the Home Minister to remove section 144, and I assured him then that everything would be normal in the city. They were very sympathetic. We also asked them to ask the Governor to revoke his decision. We were told: Why

[Shrimati Gayatri Devi]

Don't you try out your strength on the floor of the House? Having agreed to all that, we went back. When we arrived in Jaipur, I was absolutely shocked to hear that within those two hours that we were here, police firing had taken place and many innocent people had been killed. And curfew had been ordered all over the city. I tried my best to get into touch with the President and the Home Minister, but nothing was of any avail. We tried to contact the Chief Secretary but that also was of no avail, then we tried the Rajyapal but there was no response. Then, in desperation, I rang up the Prime Minister the next day because knowing that she was a woman I felt that she too would feel the same as I did about those who had been killed; and I must say that the Prime Minister was very sympathetic. But she said to me that 'always in demonstration like this, the innocent people get killed' I then pointed out to her that she was the Prime Minister of India, obviously she would get the official version, but she must also listen to the other versions because she represented the whole country. I said that the other side had told her lies. She was under the impression that the people hearing that Section 144 had been withdrawn and that the leaders were going to be released had gathered round the gate and had encircled the police force and that was why they were fired upon. I assured her that that was not true. She was also under the impression that that there was some demonstration outside the Kothwali when the police were withdrawing. I assured her that that was not true. The truth of the matter is—it is really shocking—that plain clothes policemen, who had taken a lot of bribes from certain areas, had come to Gheewalon-ka-Rastha and Haldion-ka-Rastha in Johari Bazar that morning and pointed out to senior police officials that there was no escape from these gullies; the people were crowded into these gulleys. Section 144 was withdrawn

according to the 12.30 hours radio announcement.

An hon. Member: Will it be proper to discuss all these things when the matter is *sub judice*?

Mr. Speaker: She will conclude now.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: But look at what happened, the calamity. People went about their own business thinking that section 144 was withdrawn when suddenly they were fired upon at 3.30 in the afternoon. The first to be killed was a young school boy coming back from school on his bicycle. I have had a picture taken of him.

Shri Piloo Mody: She can lay it on the Table.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: People living in second storeys were shot at through the windows. Their arms and legs have been amputated, their kidneys have been removed. All these things have happened.

An hon. Member: How many?

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: I can give the figures.

Mr. Speaker: Details may be given later.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: I would like to ask one thing. When section 144 was removed at 1.30, what was the police doing there two hours later? Section 144 had been removed from Jaipur yesterday morning, but before coming to the House, till 12 noon, according to my information, the police are still there. What are they doing? They are acting as a sort of red rag to the bull. The people just cannot bear the sight of the police. I would like to have an answer to all these things. These things are mentioned in my correspondence with the Rajyapal.

They have laid the blame on the Opposition leaders for holding a demonstration. I can tell you that that is completely untrue. Not one Congressman can walk through the streets of Jaipur today, not the

'popular' Governor nor the 'popular' Chief Minister, because they have not had the heart to go to the hospitals and see the wounded. What have they done? They gave Rs. 10,000, a mere pittance.

Yesterday, some of our MPs from Rajasthan went to meet the Home Minister. He insisted that because there was no law and order and no peace in Rajasthan, President's rule would continue over there. I would ask: when there is no section 144 in any part of the whole State, when there is law and order prevailing in the State, may we not be given an opportunity to form the government, as Shri Mohanlal Sukhadia said that even though he has a majority, he does not wish to form a government, because he is hurt by the killing of innocent people? He says this on the 13th March. Why did he not say it on the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th or 12th March? Was he not hurt then? It was because he realised that on the 13th that his party would be overthrown during the election of the Speaker of the Assembly.

We have been accused of having planned a big demonstration on the 14th morning; therefore, the Assembly should not be called. We had planned no demonstration. We, all the leaders of the Samyukta Dal, were sitting together and deciding who to put up as our candidate for Speakership. As a matter of fact, we had chosen our candidate and we were about to go to the other MLAs and say 'Look here, here is our candidate for Speaker; we have to defeat the candidate of the Congress Party on the first day.' But suddenly, President's rule was clamped on Rajasthan. Is this not unfair?

Shri Chavan talks so much about law and order not being there. Why does he not go there and see things for himself? There is complete peace in Rajasthan. He will see that the people there are terribly anxious not to have Congress rule. I have nothing against

the ruling party except their insistence on clinging to office. I want to know for what reason. Of course, we all know, all Rajasthan knows why. Because the Opposition have declared from their platform that their first act on taking office would be to hold a court of inquiry and expose the misdeeds of the Congress Ministers in Rajasthan and their supporters at the Centre. That is why President's rule has been imposed on Rajasthan. We want to get rid of it as soon as possible.

I would like to say that we have no confidence in the Government of India, we have no confidence in the Rajyapal, we have no confidence in the Chief Secretary, no confidence in the IGP nor in any of the senior officers of Rajasthan. We have great respect for the President, but we are awfully sorry that he has not used his powers to prevail upon Dr Sumpurnanand to be unbiased in his decision.

Unfortunately one of our MLAs died a couple of days ago. We are still shocked at the tragedy. But we are in a position to form the Government and we do not want any more time to be given to the Congress Party to go on using the senior officials to purchase MLAs to fabricate a majority for itself.

Mr Speaker: Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj.

Shri Mohammad Yunus Sleem: This procedure would be unfair. You will be pleased to prescribe time for speakers.

Mr. Speaker: It is done already. Time has been divided between parties.

Shri Mohammad Yunus Sleem: It is not observed.

Mr. Speaker: I will explain. Suppose one party says that 'we do not want to put up two speakers; only one Member will speak from our party'. In that case, the one Member speaking

[Mr. Speaker]

will get a little more time. There is nothing wrong in that little adjustment.

Shri K. Manoharan (Maras North): I represent the third biggest party in the Opposition. I was hoping to be called. Unfortunately, I have not been called so far. Therefore, I want to know when I would be called.

Mr. Speaker: One party after the other is being called. After the Jan Sangh, the Swatantra has got a chance, then the SSP.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedi (Kendrapara): The Swatra has been called a second time.

Mr. Speaker: I may assure Shri Manoharan that his party will be called after Shri Baja has spoken.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: May I lay the photographs and other papers referred to in my speech on the Table?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: I lay these papers on the Table*.

Mr. Speaker: These papers will be looked into and then a decision will be taken about them.

Shri Baburao Patel (Shajapur): Have you already switched over to the other side?

Mr. Speaker: I have divided the time between the Congress and the Opposition.

Shri Baburao Patel: What about the Independents?

Mr. Speaker: We have divided the time already.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to know certain facts from Maharani Gayatri Devi. First of all, I congratulate her and the other Opposition leaders in Rajasthan that because of the fear

of the strength of the Congress party, they have at least had one wisdom to be united. I am very happy at such a development because the Opposition in our country is not very strong, not very powerful; they are now becoming powerful and this is a welcome development because from the nation's point of view, it is never good that there should be only one party because if that party fails, there should be some other party able to take over the reins of government. From that angle, I am very glad that from feudal remnants right up to the Communists have got together, even though it is only with a view to defeat the Congress. There is no harm even if they got united for that reason, and the credit goes to the Congress strength that they have been able to forgo this unity among them.

I remember that during the days of national struggle, when the Princes Chamber was formed, in private meetings Sardar Patel had said that he was very happy that the Princes who never came together had at least then thought of coming together and uniting so that the Congress would have a formidable opposition to fight against. We do not want to fight or even stay with a weak opposition, and I am happy for that reason that the Opposition in Rajasthan is emerging, may be in a right or wrong way, but having emerged, they will realise the wisdom today or tomorrow, there is no harm in that. . . .

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Peermade): How many Princes have you got in your pocket?

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: I have got no Princes in my pocket. They are also honourable people as you and I and everybody is. I am not against Princes as such. I am happy that they are coming out and trying to serve the country according to their own lights. They have every right as everybody else.

*The Speaker not having subsequently accorded the necessary permission, the photographs etc. were not treated as laid on the Table.

Shri K. M. Nayyar (Palghat): Inside and outside, Princes are united.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: Even if the Opposition is uniting, it is very good, and I am congratulating them.

13.42 hrs.

[**SHRI D. S. RAJU** in the Chair]

What I am afraid is only this, that some of the facts which have been revealed by Maharani Gayatri Deviji are slightly different from the facts as we have heard from other Members and the people of Rajasthan. The facts are these. While the Congress had got votes which were roughly one per cent more than what they got in 1962, still it has not got an absolute majority. But then, no party in Rajasthan has an absolute majority this time. That is why even the Communists and the Swatantra Party, who are dramatically opposed to each other, have come together—it is a very surprising thing—for the constitutional purpose of forming a Government. They have every right to, but every vote cast against the Congress, which may be even against the Communist Party or the Swatantra Party they regard as a vote in their favour, which is not quite right, but though for practical reasons they have come together, we welcome them, and that is a very good thing.

They have claimed that they have 93 people. At one stage probably they might have had, I do not know, but it has been said that some of the independent members have gone to the Congress and told them that they are with them, and they have also gone to the other side and said the same thing, so much so that even the Governor was given to understand.....

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: Even the Governor! The Governor was given to understand everything wrong.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: You have every right to say, and I am sure you

are sincere. You say that the Governor was given to understand everything wrong, but how are we to understand that whatever you have been given to understand is absolutely correct?

Shri F. Ramamurti (Madurai): Why not call the Assembly and put it to test? Simple.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: We have the signatures of 93 Members.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: After all, even President's rule is according to the Constitution and according to parliamentary democracy. Why are you afraid if there is a delay for some time? Because you feel you will not be able to keep the entire show and all the Members with you. That is the only fear you have. After all, in a parliamentary democracy, if there is an institution of President, an institution of Governor, we must respect them. It may be that the Governor might have erred in his judgment, but as Maharani Gayatri Deviji herself has said—how far it is true it is for her to say—if a Congressman cannot go through the bazar of Jaipur city, however had he may be, if we are not allowed to go and freely move about in the city, then you cannot expect that the....

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: After you have murdered somebody, can you walk in front of the people whose kin you have murdered?

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: The point is this. It is very easy to agitate, incite the people.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: The police shot at them, we did not incite them.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: The question of shooting the people arose after an attack had been made on the police on the 4th, after you came as you said.... (Interruptions).

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: I am very sorry, this is not what I said. (Interruptions). It is for the Speaker to talk to me, you are not the Speaker.

Shri Tenneti Vishwanatham (Visakapatnam): May I respectfully submit to the Congress Party—their Deputy Leader is also here—that, after all, if Maharani Gayatri Devi interrupts, there is no use ten people waving their hands at her. It is not fair, it is not gallantry, it is not majority.

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): There should be no shouting, on both sides, but when a Member on this side speaks, if the hon. Members from the Opposition interrupt him, shout at him, there is a provocation. Even then Members on my side should not shout, I have no doubt, I do not justify that, I say it should not be done, but why do not the hon. Members in the Opposition take care? Maharani Gayatri Devi was heard patiently. Why should she not hear the other Member replying to her? That is all I am saying. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: When the Government in Rajasthan, in their own judgment, thought that the people had been incited, provoked, and, may be, there would be violence—it may be still that there was an error of judgment—and they promulgated section 144, even granting that, once there was section 144, Maharani Gayatri Devi, as she herself said, went to the Home Minister and the President of India, pleaded that section 144 should be removed, promised that there would be peace in Rajasthan if it was removed, and because of her pleading—it is not that the Central Government or the people in the Government do not respect the wishes and the advice sometimes given by the Opposition—the President probably telephoned the Governor, and the Home Minister to the Chief Minister there, and in spite of their feeling that there was a risk, still they removed section 144. At that time, maybe the police was there for precautionary purposes.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: Why?

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: But the police was attacked first. (*Interruptions*).

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: The police was not provoked, I am very sorry. I said on the floor of the House here that the people did not provoke the police. Section 144 was removed, but the police was still there.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: You have said that, let me have my say.

Shri Morarji Desai: May I say that the hon. Member, Shrimati Gayatri Devi, should not get up from time to time and try to contradict. Let him speak what he wants and it can be contradicted afterwards. But she cannot interrupt like this; it is not according to the rules of the House.

Shri K. Manoharan: But is it proper for his partymen to call her a liar?

Shri Morarji Desai: If anything like that had been said, the Speaker or the Chairman will look into it and an objection can be raised. What is the use of standing up and contradicting things like this?

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: When Maharani Gayatri Devi was speaking on this point, I listened to her quietly even though my information relating to this point was different. The police was attacked at that time and more than sixty policemen were injured.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: No. The number is three. Where do you get your information from?

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: Even granting that the number is lower, they were injured by the mob.

श्री प्रेम चन्द वर्मा (हमीरपुर) : प्राप
हम को सन्धि । हमको बोलने दीजिये उस
के बाद जवाब दीजिये ।

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: The facts are that firing had not been ordered

by the Government; it had been done by the police in self-defence. I am not now going into the merits of the firing. An enquiry has already been ordered; the facts will come out from that enquiry. We must see whether it was the fault of the Governor or of the Government or it was the fault of the mob.

Under these circumstances, who was in a position to from the Government? Many of the independents pledged their support to one party and also said that they were adherents of the other party. They say one thing at a time and another thing at another time; write one thing to the Governor but tell him something different to the Governor orally. Naturally, he was confused. He did not know where the loyalty of such Members would be. They changed their sides every hour. The Governor cannot be blamed for this. Even granting that the Governor had erred in his judgment and in advising the President to promulgate President's rule there. What is the hurry? If in a month's time or 15 days time or two months' time, when the President's rule ends, you may still form the Government if you have the majority with you..... (Interruptions.) I am parliamentary democracy, President's rule is not the rape of democracy. But it was that type of language used here. The Opposition always talks of the dignity and decorum and prestige and so on. I was really ashamed that the representatives of the people of Rajasthan came and paraded in front of the President to show where their loyalties were. I would not descend to that level if I were in that position. I will write and if I am called, I will go or I will seek an interview and explain things. If you have to stand in a parade like that, is it respectful conduct on the part of the assembly members, whether they belonged to the Opposition or the Congress Party? I think such things should stop. After all, the word has value and if one has given the word that one belongs to such and such party, one should adhere to that. The Governor should

not be put in a confused position. Shrimati Gayatri Devi also said that the Congress President, Shri Kamaraj spoke that the dissidents who fought against the Congress would not be allowed to join the Congress. They were our colleagues and friends till yesterday; they believed in the same ideology. They erred and we were sorry for them. After the elections if they were sorry for their past conduct and came back to us, it is our right to welcome them in our house, just as a spoiled child going out comes back. What is wrong about it? If she does not see anything wrong when people who fight elections on differing ideologies coming together only to oppose the Congress but she deems it wrong if members who were till yesterday. Congress members wanted to return to the Congress fold. It is not at all wrong. It is a purely internal matter. If a Congressman says to our Congress President; you should not take them because they have betrayed the Congress in the hour of trial, I can understand that. But what has the Opposition to do with the way we organise our party?

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): We can give our humble opinion.

Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj: Let that opinion be humbled and remain humbled; we do not care for such opinion. We respect the opinion of the public and the voter. To the extent we have lost our contact with the people, it will make us more active and alert so that we will now be forced to have more contact with the people. Today you are united without power; it is to be seen whether you will still remain united with power in your hands. I wish you well. We have the institution of Governors and President in parliamentary democracy and they are assigned certain functions. It is human to err. Even then, there is a saying in England: the King can do no wrong. We must establish a convention here to accept what is done by these heads of institutions here. Our Constitution provides how we can

[Shri Kamal Nayan Bajaj]

express our disapproval of them if they are insincere or dishonest or if we have lost our faith in them. But we should have respect for the institution of the President and the Governors. I am not pleading for the Prime Minister or the Chief Minister. We must establish conventions by which we do not make any charges against them if they erred. In this instance, what is the role of the Opposition? The assembly was scheduled to meet on the 20th of March. Because of the pleadings of the Opposition, the Governor called the assembly on the 14th. There is no reason why he should have called it on the 14th March. Heavens would not have fallen if one week had elapsed. Even then because of his goodwill towards the Opposition, he advanced the date to the 14th of March. There is a party called Samyukta Dal and there is also a "Save Democracy Committee". I am told that the Chairman of that committee wired to different places in Rajasthan to come to Jaipur. I think the police had this information and I would request the Home Minister to say whether this information is correct. They wanted that the Assembly should not be allowed to meet on the 15th of March. On the 14th March, the Assembly was meeting. There was swearing in ceremony; they did not want to disorganise that. But on the 15th March there was to be the Speaker's election and in the afternoon there was Governor's Address. But these people had decided that the meeting should not take place. It is in these circumstances that the Governor thought it proper to promulgate the President's rule and I think he has done good service to Rajasthan and the country.

Shri K. Manoharan: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the DMK group in Parliament, I stand to support the motion of no-confidence tabled by my friend Mr. Vajpayee. Mr. Vajpayee confined himself to the Rajasthan issue but that does not preclude me from covering a wider arena. The House has had the unique opportunity of hearing from Maharani

Gayatri Devi, regarding what happened in Rajasthan for the past so many days. (Interruption). I request you, Mr. Chairman, before entering into the subject proper, to tell the Members of the Congress party as well as the Opposition, that they must pay some heed to what the Members are speaking, about the issues involved. Generally, I support the motion out of compelling circumstances, and to a certain extent out of mental anguish and agony. I support it because I pity the Government, and because the Government has created conditions which have compelled us and roused us into such kind of no-confidence motion.

14 hrs.

You know, Mr. Chairman, the elections are over, and so many States have gone to the Opposition. One among them is, you know, my State, that is, Madras, where we have got our own Government. The stalwarts of the Congress party have been thrown out from their highest pedestals and the mighty, monolithic structure of the Congress party has been dwarfed in Tamil Nad. In the trial of strength of ideologies and aspirations, of duties and dogmas, of principles and performances, the Congress party has lost its hold; lost its strength, lost its stamina and what is more, lost its moral right and character. What has happened in Tamil Nad is a matter to be pondered over. I think it is a democratic coup. The political cyclone has swept away the big trees, tall trees the small trees from the garden of the Congress party. I am not jubilant about it in anyway. But the people of my State as well as some other States have exercised their democratic franchise properly. In fact, it is a glorious revolution, a revolution through the ballot-box. I am very happy the battle axes have been replaced by the ballot-boxes. This miracle has happened in Tamil Nad.

I am equally sorry that certain Ministers representing Madras State could not come, which denied the op-

portunity of my State in having some representation in the Cabinet, but we could not help it, because the significance of the verdict of the people of my State is this: they did not communicate their decision either to the ruling party or to the Opposition till they exercised their franchise during the time of the elections. I congratulate the great people of this great country for what they have done to preserve the democratic traditions and the democratic institutions of this country.

Now, I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that democracy, though a fumbling process, often works with exasperating incompetence through trial and error, would have come to stay; in spite of the ruling party's systematic stifling of democracy, now, we are convinced that this democracy will definitely stay and it will give a guiding light and serve as a lighthouse to the steering ship of State. I have no guts to say that the victory of the progressive forces of our country is a victory of the political parties. On the contrary, I must say that it is a victory of the great people of this country.

Any attempt, directly or indirectly, taken by the Government to stifle the democratic institutions would be considered as an outrage on democracy, and will be met effectually by the people of this nation. Police Raj has ceased to exist and the people's raj should come into being. The conversion of Rajasthan into a slaughter-house of democracy by the Congress people in Rajasthan, in collusion with the dubious character of the tragic drama, that is, the Governor of Rajasthan, is going to be a disgrace to this country. It is going to be a faulty, imoral act undertaken by the Government of India. The unconstitutional step that the Government of India has taken has been clearly exposed and explained by Maharani Gayatri Devi and my hon. friend Shri Vajpayee yesterday. I expect a sense of compassion and compunction from the Congress side after having heard what has happened in Rajasthan through the Members of the Opposition.

So far as my State is concerned, it is in perfect order, because we have got an absolute majority in spite of some stalwarts assuring the country for the past so many months that the DMK at no time shall form a Ministry. But I hope that good sense has dawned upon the Rip Van Winkle of this part of the country, now they are telling, "We never expected this much". I have been telling all these people that the DMK is a mass party, a party which has sown deep roots in the people's mind and a party which has given enough hopes and shapes to the aspirations of the people and a party which mirrors the aspirations and feelings of the people of my country.

Here, in spite of the opportunity afforded and provided to the people of Rajasthan, the Congress party found it fit how best to stifle it and see that democracy is completely and absolutely, either raped or murdered ultimately. Had the chance been given for the Opposition to rule Rajasthan, it would have been better for the Congress party to test its strength, but unfortunately it did not. One reason stated was, violence was spreading all over Rajasthan and therefore, "we could not." It was said that the law and order situation was out of control and therefore "we could not." I recall what happened in Tamil Nad. During the anti-Hindi agitation, completely the law and order was out of control. The scandalous collapse of the law and order situation was manifested in the State of the Madras. I invited the attention of the then Prime Minister, the late Lal Bahadur Shastri, to this matter, and I requested the President of this country, who is the linchpin of the Constitution, to see that the Madras Government was dismissed because military rule was proclaimed and the military personnel were alerted, and therefore, to see that the Madras Government was toppled and let the President assume powers. But what did the Central Government do? The Government said, "The law and order situation is all right; therefore, there is no necessity to pro-

[Shri K. Manoharan]

claim President's rule." I do not think the situation in Rajasthan was bigger than or more crucial than the situation which we had in Madras State some months ago. That explains very clearly that the Congress party in the Central Government, having adopted a partisan attitude and very perfectly partial, as far as possible try to help their own Ministry to function. If there is a possibility of the emergence of the Opposition party to come up and function, they have shown how best to curb it down; that has been explained very clearly.

In this context, I wanted to draw the attention of the House to a particular fact which cannot be forgotten. After the fourth general elections, the composition of this House has been altered and the complexion of the House has been changed. The brute majority which the Congress party had in the past has been considerably minimised, and the opposition augmented. Therefore, the situation poses a peculiar problem which the forefathers of our Constitution might not have anticipated. That is the condition now with which we are faced. My point today is that the ruling party should consider that aspect of the issue and see that they could better the situation in Parliament, because we have got a federal constitution; seemingly so; it is a federal constitution. The federal constitution of India, I think after the fourth general elections, needs reorientation. That is my point. It has to be clearly understood that federalism is generally the result of the people's unwillingness to submit to one central authority. Another cause is a distinct aversion to a mere majority rule in all spheres of life. A fair deal to minorities is inherent in federal policies. Again, due to the vastness of the country and unequal distribution of wealth and what not of the country, due to the varying degrees of development of the peoples of this nation politically, culturally, economically and educationally, there is a sort of aversion for

unitary rule and preference for federalism.

Dynamism in outlook and practice is necessary for keeping the federal State alive. If a changing society necessitates redistribution of powers among the States and the Centre, there should not be any hesitation from that side to face such an issue, because that is the crying need of the hour. Constitutional demarcation of spheres of action and autonomy or independence within the sphere are the two major characteristics of the federal element.

You will agree, Mr. Chairman, in maintaining that federalism in the modern age is the principle of reconciliation between two divergent tendencies, the widening range of common interests and the need for local autonomy. What is needed today is neither complete independence nor total dependence, but the interdependence of the States and the Centre. I am simply analysing this proposition because we have got a Government in Madras. This can be and shall be the ideal for a large country like India composed of divergent forces.

In essence, federalism is a mechanism or a political contrivance to bridle up democracy lest it fall into the trap of authoritarianism and totalitarianism engineered by a scheming, powerful and cunning party like the Congress Party. In this connection, I want to quote for the consideration of the House pithily the summary that has been given by the Chief Justice of India, Justice Subba Rao regarding the benefits of federalism in the truest sense of the term:

"It helps to decentralised power. It gives the people of different parts of the country a feeling of participation in the affairs of the State. It inspires in them pride and satisfaction of governing themselves. It moves the machinery of the State much quicker and more efficiently than in a

Unitary State. It enables a State Government, which must be expected to know the difficulties peculiar to the State, to act more effectively to remove them and improve the conditions of its people. It gives training and experience in the art of governing to the leaders of the State. It gives full scope for the fulfilment of the economic, political and cultural aspirations of the people. It enables each State to work out its destiny to suit its genius and the peculiar and special conditions obtaining therein. It affords emotional satisfaction to different linguistic, religious and ethical groups. It safeguards more effectively individual rights for, while an all-powerful Centre may destroy individual liberty, the division of authority between units is itself a sufficient brake on that tendency. It helps public opinion being reflected in the activities of the State Government and the existence of the Government at close quarters creates greater responsibility among the people. While it prevents fissiparous tendencies, it avoids regimentation of thought and action throughout the country. It is indeed a modern formula between the fractionalisation which is destructive of national solidarity and centralisation which is destructive of local autonomy."

This is what Justice Subba Rao has said about the benefits of federalism.

Having said this, I must say that the Indian scheme of federation is so heavily loaded on the side of a strong union that it almost approaches a unitary State. Neither like the Constitution of the United States of America nor like Canada, the Constitution of India is unitary in spirit and federal in garb.

I wish to draw the attention of the House to certain articles which dominate the Indian Constitution and which snatch away the federal traits. The following articles will explain how

unitary tendencies dominate our federal structure: Article 248—Residuary powers of legislation are vested in the Union Government. Article 249—The Union Government can trench upon the State list in national interest. Article 251—Parliamentary law prevails over the law of the legislature when the latter is repugnant to any of the provisions of the former. In matter enumerated in the Concurrent List, Union law prevails when it is in conflict with State law. Article 252—Parliament has powers to legislate for two or more States by consent and adoption by those States. Article 250—Parliament becomes empowered to legislate on any subject even though in the State list when the President has proclaimed the State of National Emergency.

Hence the Constitution of India is quasi-federal. It established a unitary State with subsidiary federal features rather than a federal State with subsidiary unitary features. Therefore, it is high time for the Government of India which has already become a leviathan to be shown off its abominable adipose.

In this connection, I wish to quote the policy statement of the Government of Madras outlined by the Governor of Madras very recently:

"The time has come when the State should be clothed with more powers to enable them to translate the aspirations of the people into actualities. There is today a growing urge for federalism in practice."

The Governor added:

"In the light of the situation emerging after the fourth General Elections, there was need to underline the federal character of the Indian Constitution and restore the States to the position originally visualised for them under the Constitution. States can no longer be passive spectators in the process of formulation and implementation of Plans but should play a more active part."

[Shri K. Manoharan]

The point to which I draw the attention of the House is that the Union Government should not make the States chronic dependents on itself. No father will allow his son or daughter to depend completely on him for anything and everything for years to come. Therefore, it is the basic duty of the Central Government to see that each State crawls itself, walks itself like a majestic youth and finally depends completely on itself and on its own growth and life.

Immediately after assumption of office, the Chief Minister of Madras, my respected and revered leader Mr. C. N. Annadurai, said that his Government would cooperate with the Central Government. Immediately responding to the gesture of my leader, the Prime Minister of India has readily consented and said that the Central Government would definitely give assistance and cooperation to the Madras Government. I think this is a good beginning of mutual understanding of the different political complexions. Here emerges a new trend in the field of the concept of federal complex—I call it cooperative federalism. If this cooperative federalism is not guaranteed, if the attitude of the Central Government is that by giving assistance to the State Governments the State Governments may fare well and it may not be conducive to the growth of the Congress Party in those States, I want to give a warning to the Congress people, because they fail to read what is written on the wall. That is why you are here like this with a reduced majority. Try to understand the feelings of the people of my State as well as the country at large (*Interruption*). Therefore, my request to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the Prime Minister of this country, is this. Luckily or otherwise, this country has got six or seven State Ministries from the Opposition. After 1972 I do not know whether the Congress Party would be here to rule the country (*Interruption*). I am not expecting that because it is a major

political party. The Congress Party which has got independence for the nation, a party which has been inspired by the great leader like Mahatma Gandhi and leaders like Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, has come down to the lowest level of the expectation of the people. That is all my objection. Even now I wish the Congress Party, though dilapidated, though emaciated, though it may not get its natural strength hereafter, to emerge out successful and give a correct lead to the people of this country. But I do not think that will be possible because the people of this country do not want them.

Sir, one more point and I have done. The next point I want to make is about the language policy which has been the policy of my party. I am very glad to announce to the House that that is the policy of majority of the parties in Parliament. Sir, you might recall what I said on the last occasion, that a statutory shape to the assurance given by the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, should be given because we consider the assurance given by the late Prime Minister as a Magna Carta protecting the rights of the people of non-Hindi-speaking areas. Fortunately or otherwise, wantonly or otherwise—I do not know—the predecessors of the present Prime Minister have systematically put all our requests and demands into cold storage. In the last Parliament also we asked what happened to the statutory shape being given to the late Prime Minister's assurance. We were told that it would be given. But it did not come. Luckily the President's Address mentions about the statutory shape being given to the Prime Minister's assurance. That comes from the President and, therefore, I am tempted to believe it, because I am not in the habit of believing assurances given by the Congress Ministers. Assurances are like pie crusts to them meant to be broken. So many assurances have been broken. This time we want that statutory shape to the Prime Minister's assurance should be given.

My second point on this is this. In fact, I cannot express my views adequately in English. I am ashamed for that. But if I am asked to speak in Tamil—that is the language in which I speak—my contribution to parliamentary tradition would be immense. For example, with your permission, Sir, I may say, for the information of the House, that Shri A. K. Gopalan, leader of the Left Communist Party here, is a top-ranking orator in Kerala in Malayalam. But Shri Gopalan is denied the opportunity to speak in his mother tongue in the Parliament, the Parliament which is the forum where the will of the people is expressed, were the heart-throbs of the nation are recorded. Why can I not speak in Tamil here? The leader of the DMK Group, Professor Anbazhagan, is one of the class orators in Tamil in the State of Madras. If he is allowed to speak in Tamil Parliament will have the unique opportunity of enjoying not only the richness of his thought, the exuberance of his thought, but also the splendour of his diction and music of his voice. Unfortunately, we are denied that opportunity.

The Minister of Planning, Petroleum and Chemicals and Social Welfare (Shri Asoka Mehta): Who is denying?

Shri K. Manoharan: Let me explain my point. I requested Sardar Hukam Singh, who was the then Speaker, to give me a chance to speak in Tamil. The immediate answer from our ex Speaker was: "You have proved yourself to be a speaker in English; therefore, I cannot give permission." All right. I then sent some other Member from my group requesting the Speaker to give him an opportunity to speak in Tamil. What the Speaker said was: "Constitutionally my hands are fettered; I am helpless". We asked him: "Why" "Because", he said, "constitutionally only two languages are allowed to be employed in the deliberations of this House, one is English and the other is Hindi". My objection

to it is this. This objection should be taken into consideration in all sincerity possibly because that entails the integration of the country (*Interruption*). You may turn round and say that if I ask the Speaker or if anybody from my Group asks the Speaker for permission to speak in Tamil he will give it. But—there is a big 'if'—he will say that in advance the translation of the gist of the speech in English should be given to the Speaker. If any Hindi brethren—of course, I respect his sentiments and wish—wants to speak in Hindi straightaway he can stand up and speak because that is his mother tongue, he has that voice and right to speak in that language. If I want to speak in Tamil I am not immediately permitted, there is this so-called paraphernalia of giving a translation in advance, which I consider to be rather humiliating. Therefore, Sir, I want to submit this on behalf of the people of Kerala and the people of Tamil Nad. I have got 24 members in my Group. All are young, Unfortunately. The congress people are all old. That is a different matter. My comrades are young, energetic, with dynamism and initiative and drive. Majority of them would not be in a position to express their views in English properly. Unfortunately, they do not know Hindi. Therefore, the only way out is that they should be allowed to speak in Tamil without submitting a translation of their speech in advance to the Speaker, a procedure which is very unfair and humiliating. This is my submission to you, Sir, for you to pass it on to the Speaker of the House as well as the Prime Minister. I am very happy majority of the Congress Members relish my point. I am equally very happy the Opposition parties without any sense of reservation and difference have joined in one bloc. Therefore, it is now easy to solve the problem. I think by introducing a Bill in this House all the fourteen languages should be given equal parity and right in the deliberations in this House (*Interruption*). Mr. Chairman, you should take the feelings of this House on this particular issue, which is very favourable to us, to the Spea-

[Shri K. Manoharan]

ker and see that it is immediately done. I hope you will do that.

Shri Tenneti Viswasatham: Sir, may I trust that the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister, the Home Minister and all other big Ministers that matter have been hearing this speech of Shri Manoharan carefully from their private chambers?

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): It is only fair that they should be here.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the mover of the Motion of No-confidence, Shri Vajpayee, it appears, was in a hurry to bring this motion of no-confidence and discuss the matter of Rajasthan while the matter was hot. Under the circumstances the Opposition probably wanted to talk it out. We have read the reports in the Press that the trouble started because of a very narrow majority in Rajasthan Assembly. Doubts were expressed whether the Congress was in a majority or the Opposition was in a majority. We as laymen, reading from Press reports or the statements of hon. Ministers were not able to decide one way or the other. They say the Governor was at fault and he should have waited for some time. I am quite sure if the opposition had the required majority they would have formed the Government. On behalf of the Congress Party, I can assure the Opposition that my party will never oppose their forming a Government in Rajasthan in a constitutional manner. Only 20 years back, in Rajasthan, the house of Dungarpur Maharawal, the Maharaja and Maharani of Jaipur and the Maharaja of Bikaner could not unite, but I am glad in the year 1967 they could unite because of a common goal. They had a scheme in 1947 to renounce power and accede their States to the Indian Union. I am happy to see that the power which they had shed, they are running for it and they are united for this purpose. I am a little surprised to

learn that the members of the opposition are rallying behind the leadership of the princes. There is nothing wrong in it, because the elected princes are also equally representatives of the people. I am glad that what Sardar Patel foresaw is coming true and the princes are uniting and taking interest in the affairs of the State.

Maharani Gayatri Devi made some challenging statements. For instance, she mentioned that no Congressman can walk the streets of Jaipur. Well, I am a Congressman and I am prepared to walk the streets of Jaipur. If anybody wants to kill me, let them do so. I am prepared to face the consequences I have been a Congressman for the last 37 years.

Shri A. B. Vajpayee (Balrampur): She was not holding out a physical threat.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: I had myself been in the opposition for three years time before I joined the Congress. So, I have experience as an opposition member also. I have re-joined Congress because the opposition has no goal except running for power. Let me warn the members of the opposition that those who run for power shall not have power. They can occupy chairs and they can rejoice at the weakness of the Congress because of the factions in it. But they will not be able to maintain power for long. It is because of the factions in the Congress that they are gaining ground. But the Congress will survive so long as true and honest Congressmen are there. The number does not matter. Even if there is only one honest Congressman, as against 99 99 999 others, if he has the courage of conviction which Mahatma Gandhi taught, the party will survive. We are meant to serve the people. It is we that have trained the opposition how to come to power. We taught them how democracy can function. It is only because of the Congress party's belief in democracy that the opposition parties are able to defeat the Congress and

come to power. So, let us agree on one point, let democracy live. We are not worried whether Congress is in power or not. We will not be sad if Congress loses power in all States. But we will have to function through democratic methods and lead the country to prosperity. I am not at all unhappy in losing power in Madras, Bihar, Kerala or other States. We will not be sad if Congress loses power in Rajasthan either. But we are determined to keep democracy alive. That is the main thing. We as Congressmen are keen to see that the country follows democratic traditions.

I would request my Congress colleagues to restrain themselves and not shout and disturb the opposition in any way. My contention is that we, as elders should restrain ourselves and behave in a very dignified manner. We should not be hostile. We must tolerate the opposition. As Shri Bajaj has rightly stated, this country needs a strong opposition. We shall be only too glad if one day a strong opposition party removes Congress from power and takes up the reins of office. We are prepared to sit on the other side of the House. But the opposition has to make that challenge, not in this House but through the ballot box. If you work hard, the masses will be with you and we will not be sad at all about it.

Coming to the events in Rajasthan, if the Congress party desires to capture power, it would not have allowed the elections to come in the away. They would have managed to have army rule or dictatorship. But Congress did not do it; it wanted to have elections. If the Congress party has no majority in the legislature in Rajasthan, it will not accept office there like in other States. But we will have to follow the procedures laid down in the Constitution.

I am in full sympathy with those who are killed there. Let the Maharani and the Rajasthan leaders contribute money for distribution to the dependents of the deceased. I shall also

contribute my humble share. We have always witnessed it in this country that whenever there is a struggle for power the innocent men suffer. My heart goes to those who have been killed in Rajasthan. It is a sad incident.

Here I am not giving any sermon. I am only giving my experience. We should not rush for power, as most of the people are doing. Service should be the motto of the members. I have been saying the same thing to the members of my party also. While we are in Delhi, let us do some service. I would invite the members of the opposition also to forget the party alliances and go to the jhuggies and jhompres and do some service to the down-trodden people. Let us clean the streets and the huts and help those people in every possible way. If any member of the opposition invites me to do that work, I will join him tomorrow. After all, the country can rise high only by service; not by big words or high ideals. We must put into practice what we preach. As far as I am concerned, I can assure the opposition that I normally speak less and I always try to practice what I preach. I do not quarrel with them. During the last five years they could never have seen me shout in or doing anything which is undignified or improper.

We are all like brothers. I have no quarrel with any parties here. We must serve our nation and in the service we are all united. Let us forget and forgive the little incidents that we witness in the House. Let us forget them and have close association. After all, we wish well of this country. Even the members of the opposition wish well of the Congress. Let the Congressmen, on their part, mend their methods. They must unite and remove corrupt people from their midst. They must be honest. I am sorry that so many of the Congressmen have not rendered accounts of their property to the party. I am one of those who have regularly rendered accounts of the property and the bank

[Shri Narendra Singh Mahida]

balance. I want the Congressmen to be always honest. We should not be running after majority at the expense of honesty. Let us be only few; it does not matter. I will not mind if thousand elections are lost and we are in a minority. Yet, we should be steadfast in our belief in honesty. I know my friends too well. Everybody is running for power. My class of people have been in power for thousand years in this country. But I can boldly say that I never run for any power. I am proud to remain a humble citizen of this country without any power.

So far as Congressmen are concerned, they should keep service before self. As long as the Congress serves the country, it will not suffer.

This no-confidence motion really shows the lack of confidence of the opposition parties in themselves. So, being an humble, honest and straightforward Congressman, I oppose this no-confidence motion.

Shri S. A. Dange (Bombay Central South): Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the no confidence motion, moved by Shri Vajpayee, on behalf of the Communist Party. The reasons for supporting such a motion, I want to give later on, but the first question that may legitimately be asked is, this Ministry or this Council of Ministers has been in its gadi only for the last 5 or 6 days and how can we of the opposition decide within five days that they deserve no-confidence on our part or on the part of the country have they done in the last five days something so that you can say that you have no confidence in them. Well, to answer that question a few more things will have to be looked into.

When the elections came, you know in what state the country was. The question of food crisis was there, starvation was there and unemployment was there. There was the ques-

tion of giving land to the peasants and housing to the poor people. All these questions were there and all these questions were being tried to be resolved by the Congress Party, which was in power on the eve of the elections, by means of ordinances, arrests, firings and by denying the demands of the people. With that framework behind them they entered the elections.

We, of the Opposition parties, certainly while differing on certain essentials of programme had at least one approach, that the Congress after its 19 years of rule has ceased to have the confidence of the people and should be defeated at the polls and that a democratic government be instituted in its place. This single programme—each party had its own elaborate programme and more or less all the Opposition parties had one—that this 19 years' despotism, which in between may have been right or wrong on smaller matters but which on the whole on general policies was wrong, should be removed.

With this we went into the elections and they did not expect that they would be dethroned from so many areas. More or less three Indians out of five have gone out of the orbit of Congress power. In these elections, just as in the previous elections, it is found that they did not get the majority of the votes in the country. So, *ipso facto*, by the judgment of the people, they are a minority and if there had been a rule of proportional representation in this House, the Congress would not have been in the majority. The very fact that they have not got the majority of the votes in the country is enough to justify our vote of no-confidence in them on the very first day, let alone after five days.

That apart, five days had passed and what had they done in these five days? Somebody will say, "What

can we do in five days?" But what had they done in five hours after they were sworn in? The first step that they took was to establish President's rule in Rajasthan. Could they not think of any other measure? Could they not think of the problems of the people? Various ordinances and other things were there which had to be amended and something more had to be done. Why within five hours had the Rajasthan Assembly to be suspended? Because there was danger to law and order!

My hon friend, Shri Manoharan, who spoke, here pointed out that two years back there was danger to law and order in Tamilnad but no President's rule was established. When the UP civil servants went on strike for a whole month and there was absolutely no law, no order, no government in UP—nothing except Congress factions fighting against each other—why was President's rule not established in UP at that time? When there was famine and trouble in Bihar and when Shri K. B. Sahay proved to be completely incompetent to rule even for one day, why was President's rule not established in Bihar? Why was President's rule not established in Bengal when Shri P. C. Sen's bankruptcy was declared to the world? Why was it established within five hours by a Central Ministry coming into power, in a State where a very learned Governor could not distinguish between 93 and 89, could not distinguish that 93 is a majority and is more by four votes than 89, who debbles in astronomical mathematics and cannot determine whether 89 is minority or 93 is a minority? Such a learned Governor is advised and then the Chief Minister, Shri Sukhadia, the leader of the Party, runs about saying, "Mine is the largest single party". Yes, but there was the largest single Opposition. He says, "I can sustain the majority" and is told, "Please do". They even hurried to call the Assembly on the 14th March instead of on

the 20th March. They were so confident. And on the 13th March, after this Council of Ministers was sworn in, they advised the young man, "You do not know, when the Assembly meets your 89 or 93 will not remain and there will be trouble." And if there is trouble in Rajasthan, something else was brewing.

It was not only Rajasthan that was the aim of the Council of Ministers. The aim was Uttar Pradesh. Uttar Pradesh was on the brink of losing its Congress rule. If Rajasthan had been captured by that majority and had established its Opposition ministry, Shri C. B. Gupta would never have been called to the power in Uttar Pradesh. And if Uttar Pradesh is lost to the Congress, and along with Bihar, it goes out of their hands, their empire is finished in India for ever. That is the thing. So, they were guarding the monopoly of power in Uttar Pradesh by hitting at Rajasthan, apart from what other thing they may have had in mind. It was a tactical, well calculated move; hold the morale, stop Rajasthan and enable Shri C. B. Gupta and others to buy over or do something in order to capture the biggest State in India, Uttar Pradesh. So, they did this within five hours.

They did not think of ending the Emergency. Five days after, the Home Minister can come and say that on 1st July, three months later, he will end the emergency. Why not within six hours of resuming power, please? Why should it continue for three months? They want to see for three months; they want to see for three months in how many States they still are going to lose and if they lose more the emergency will end on the 1st July but President's rule in the whole country will come. We know it. I want the House and the people of this country that the sinister forces sitting in the Council of Ministers are not innocent gentlemen loyal to a certain programme which they put forward in the elections. Why three months more for the Emergency to end?

[Shri S. A. Dange]

And then also it will remain in certain areas. What special areas? Tribals. You cannot trust the Tribal areas to manage their own affairs, to be inside the country and to manage the whole of the affairs of the country in partnership with you and others and so on! Those areas are selected for special treatment of an emergency rule while the whole of the country will be rid of that emergency.

My hon. friend, Mr. Bajaj who argued about the Constitution, may say that even when Parliament is dismissed and President's rule is imposed in the whole country, it is a democracy. Wonderful democracy this according to the definition of the Congress leadership, that President's rule is also a part of the democratic set-up!

I need not go into the details of the Rajasthan affairs, but I want to ask why within five hours of being sworn in, they took this sinister move. In order to guard their ministries from toppling down in other places or in order to help their ministries being formed in other places? Otherwise, the facts have been given by Shrimati Gayatri Devi. I do not know why I should always mention the titles as many Congressmen have been doing, Maharaja So-and-so, Maharani Gayatri Devi and so on. I have no objection to her remaining a maharani if she becomes a democratic maharani at some time. In any case, I am objecting to the Congress telling me that we in Rajasthan, as a Communist Party, cast our vote in the company of the maharajas. If they can play tactics, we of the Communist Party also can play tactics. We are opposed to maharajas and maharanis. They have been retained by the Congress Party, not by us. All the palaces in Jaipur are left there and rented by the Congress Ministry for holding the meetings of the Legislative Assembly, not by us. I need not detail all these things; they know it very well. So, why throw it at us? Are you prepared to fight the maharajas' privileges, confiscate their

lands and if the maharajas have blossomed into monopolists and industrialists, deal with them as industrialists and wipe out their privileges?

Why was Maharawal Lakshman Singh released from police custody when the other peasants, workers, middle-class people and traders were held in prison? Because there is a rule that a prince, if he is arrested, cannot be put up before a magistrate—he has to be put up within 24 hours—without the permission of the Central Government and the Central Government did not dare give the permission to the police in Jaipur to put up the Maharawal before a magistrate or put the Maharawal in a lock-up for more than 24 hours. You are telling me that we are supporting maharajas. You are doing it when the fight is going on. Please do not throw that challenge at us. We know when to be with whom and for what purpose because our ultimate aim is the democratic Republic of India to prosper and to herald socialism. If in that process we have to align with some people, in order to throw away your rule.....

Shri Dhuleshwar Meena (Udaipur): On a point of order.

Shri S. A. Dange: I will give place to you, if you like

Shri Dhuleshwar Meena: Your member is also with the Opposition.

Shri S. A. Dange: He is in the block, I am playing tactics.

An hon. Member: He has not understood it.

Shri S. A. Dange: I am sorry; that is not my fault I cannot speak in Hindi as others do because I belong to Maharashtra and Marathi cannot be spoken unless I give prior translation of what I will speak, which I do not know myself. Such a wonderful rule of democracy is there. I cannot help you.

एक कानूनीय सदस्य : आप हिन्दी
झुकी जानते हैं । मैं ने आपको सुना है ।

Shri S. A. Dange: The first thing that the Council of Ministers did was a blow to democracy. They should cancel it now. Since they wanted to call the Assembly on 20th, the 20th has come and let them call the Assembly soon and let the President's rule be lifted and the things squared up. May be they win; may be, we win. We shall see. They have not done this. In the first six hours, they took the most undemocratic step in the State and, therefore, I support the Motion of No-Confidence that is moved here.

The second point that I want to make is this. It is said that we should have given them time to prove themselves because they have come only now. What is there to prove themselves? Look at the Council of Ministers. Does it take five days or five months or one year more to know what they will do? They will exactly do what they did before because the leadership in the Congress Party remains exactly what it was. What was it?

Take, for instance, devaluation. Who imposed it on the country? Then, there was food crisis. Who imposed it on the country. The lack of land reforms was responsible for the failure of food production in the country and P.L. 480 was responsible for discouraging the peasants from producing food in this country. They would rather pay dollars to the Americans than money to the peasants. Then, on the eve of elections, everybody started being progressive saying, "We will now abolish the land revenue." Everybody started lifting land revenue from the peasants' head on the eve of elections. Why did not you think before? For five years, you were there and the food production was falling. You did not do it earlier.

Now, take first the Prime Minister. In her first broadcast which she makes, when she comes on the *gaddi*, is there a ringing call for the mobilisation of the people and the national resources, for the satisfaction of the demands of our working class, the peasantry, in

order that they put their shoulders to the wheel of production and lift the country out of the crisis? Is there a ringing call in her broadcast to destroy those 75 monopoly houses which are ruining the economy of this country? Is there a ringing call to take away the monopoly of power from five big banks which we know are the source of black-market power and underground finance in the country? Is there a ringing call in the first broadcast of our new Prime Minister whom we knew for the last one year we had hoped that there would be new blood and a new policy—for a new policy? We were told in the press that she was chasing for a new leadership and what she got by her side was the same old rotten leadership again. What was there in her broadcast? I do not want to go into necklaces and all that. I would rather pay attention to the head and the content of the head rather than to the necklace which is worn by that head. I am not bothered about that. What was there in the broadcast? A big zero.

Then comes the Deputy Prime Minister in-charge of Finance. What can I expect from him? When he was the Finance Minister, he imposed on the country the highest taxes on wage goods, goods consumed by the normal, ordinary people. He was such a wonderful, expert Finance Minister. When he imposed taxes on tea and when the prices of tea rose, he said, "I am not responsible." Why? Because, he said, he imposed only 1 nP on 12 cups of tea. It is wonderful economic. I do not know how he worked it out. How can a hotel keeper not charge 11 customers old price and charge only the 12th customer 1 extra paisa because the Finance Minister increased only 1 nP on 12 cups? This was the Finance Minister we had before. He ruined the economy of the country. He got a respite and now he comes forward as a new-comer who is not responsible for what happened before, since he was guillotined under the Kamaraj Plan. But we cannot forget his past; we cannot forget his

[Shri S. A. Dange]

taxation policy. The moment his name was announced, all the gold-smiths started trembling in India and all the smugglers are enjoying the whole joke. We had told them before that all their Gold Control rules will only increase smuggling and raise the price of gold and that it will not stop smuggling. All the gold that was seized from one hoarder in Rajasthan under Mr. Sukhadia's own rule and kept in custody had have disappeared from the hands of the police. That itself is a proof of the complete failure on the part of the Finance Minister in his past period and it will be a failure in future too. Therefore, I say, "No confidence in you."

Take another Minister the Home Minister, who is personally responsible for the Rajasthan affair—it is said that it is a Cabinet decision; I cannot say much about it—he has a reputation of being a question-mark. He is an enigma to his own country and to his own party. What is he? How can you have confidence in a great person who is himself a great question-mark and a great enigma? I think, he will resolve that question-mark to the satisfaction of the people. But when he is there with the question-mark, I cannot have confidence in him. How can I confide in him? (*Interruption*) The Council of Ministers is a Council of serious people.

Now, take the one Minister who went to America and advised them about back-seat driving and about India being ripe for some fertilisation. The back-seat driver is now put to the front seat and is made the Minister in-charge of Petroleum and Fertilisers. What he is going to fertilise I do not know. But about Petroleum, I know it. After 15 years of our effort, we have developed the petroleum industry to which all the monopolies of America and Britain objected and after raising it up, we find that the offshore drilling and the best oil places are going to be sold to the American monopolies. Will the Petroleum Minister resist that pressure? He did not resist it when he

was in the Planning Commission; he could not resist it when he went to America and he could not resist it when he came back. Can I have confidence in Mr. Ashok Mehta; at one time a great socialist, another time a back-seat-driver, and third time a front seat Minister in-charge of Petroleum and Fertilisers? Can such a bunch of people, such a Council of Ministers, inspire confidence in them? No, Sir. Their whole past belies their programme. They have a programme. Some people say, they have a socialist programme. Where is socialism? There are 75 monopoly houses and Rs. 3,000 crores with only five banks. Is that the manifesto of the Congress socialism? Since you do not agree to change it, since in the first five days, you have not even issued one ordinance to check the strings of monopoly power and of banks, since in the first five days you have not conferred any benefit on the masses, since in the first five days my friend, the Labour Minister, has not even agreed to restore the bonuses that were due to the workers and has not cared to stop the one day closures affecting 700,000 workers in the textile mills—the textile workers are suffering, the peasants are suffering; the traders are suffering—they have no eyes for all that, how can I have any confidence in them? The only thing they can see is, how the Congress must possess Rajasthan, must possess Uttar Pradesh and must possess Bihar. It is not we who are hankering after power. It is they who are trying to cling to power which is no longer with them. The constitutional dictator-ship that they exercised before the elections is out to be destroyed by a constitutional revolution. If they want a constitutional democracy and a constitutional revolution, then in that case, I would advise them to do these jobs during this period.

15 hrs.

Let me not refer to history which is all forgotten, but here, some of us are in the days when the first revolt against the Bourbons was started, and

a flood of people had gathered at the *Plas de la Concorde* in Paris; they did not ask for promises; they did not ask for pledges; they did not ask for vows, but they said 'Down with the Bourbons; those who care sign the pledge' And at *La Concorde* Court, there were certain landlords, there were certain princes, there were certain capitalists, and the wonderful workers and peasants, but all signed together. And when the king ran away, they said 'No' to the monarchy and handed it 'To the lamp-post and the guillotine'. Then, the princes ran away and the landlords ran away. When the revolution came on the streets, because it could not be confined to the Constituent Assembly, the revolution marched forward. If my hon friends opposite do not want that march forward to the guillotine on the streets here, I would request them for God's sake, to clean up the whole thing, to institute a new policy and within the next seven days to issue new ordinances destroying the monopolists who are sitting behind them and making them even quarrel; mind you, they are making them even to quarrel; we have had the unseemly quarrel of a Deputy and the Chief, the one *de jure* and the other *de facto*. All this is ruining the country. It is not only we on this side who are fighting this. But they have also got to fight this. I am not waiting for 25 of them to walk over to my side and give us a majority as someone said. No. I am not asking for that, because when it comes to that, some 30 or so from this side might walk over to that side; I quite do not know. But in any case, we shall try to prevent that possibility. I do not want just to crack their power with the aid of 25 or 30 people waking over, but I want to crack their policies; I want to crack the monopolists; I want to crack the banks; I want to crack all this superstructure that they have built up in 19 years and make way for the peasants and the workers, and re-impose those good laws which we had passed and which had been dethroned by certain judgments such as those relating to bonus, minimum wages and so on.

I want them not to impose taxes on the consumer goods of the people. I want them to reduce taxation and not resort to the bogus planning which has been placed before us by the Planning Commission. I want the Council of Ministers to do all this. If they could have done that, it would have infused confidence in the people in the very first five days. But in view of their past tradition, in view of their past policy, in view of their past personal careers—I do not mean 'private', but I meant careers in the public sphere—they are such that I cannot expect a change; I cannot expect the revolutionary change which has been demanded by the people. I do not want to go into the constitutional quagmires here and there or the provisions here and there. But in the three or four or six States where we are in power, we are trying to give a parallel picture and we hope we shall succeed; I say that we are hoping because at the Centre sit these gentlemen who can play all sorts of tricks; in fact, it is not merely that, but I am afraid that down below there are the 75 monopolists who are going to create a crisis in production and put it on our heads and say that it is these fellows in Bengal and Bihar who are creating the crisis in production. I know that the banks and the blackmarketeers are inciting revolts of a wrong kind; I know that there would be revolts of a right kind which we are also going to launch. But these revolts of a wrong kind will be against the country's economy. But revolts of our kind will be against the monopolists. When faced with these revolts, where will my hon. friends opposite stand? I want that answer from them because on that answer will depend my answer. Their answer, in view of their past tradition will be that they will stand with tradition and they will stand with the 75 monopolists; they will stand with the bankers and they will stand with all those people; they will cling to the old thing whereas we want to destroy the old thing.

Therefore, I support the motion of no-confidence in this Council of Ministers.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): I cannot claim that I have heard all the speeches, but certainly I have heard the most important speeches in this debate...

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): It is an aspersion on the Members. Every Member's speech is an important one.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Not necessarily; I was only referring to my presence in the House because I had to be in the other House also for some time. My hon. friend did not allow me to complete my sentence; I was going to say that even though I had not heard the speeches of the other Members, I had certainly got the important points that they had made..

Some of the Members naturally confined themselves to the specific issue on which this no-confidence-motion is based. Others naturally tried to cover general issues and they made the attack a little more comprehensive. But I would certainly like, to begin with, to confine myself to the Rajasthan issue itself, in respect of which Shri Vajpayee had decided to move this no-confidence motion.

I would like to state the facts as they are about this Rajasthan affair. Some Members have tried to make out that this was the first act of this new democratic government. Yes, it is one of the major acts after the Council of Ministers was sworn in. But any government has to perform its duty even though it is a sad duty. And a Proclamation of this type had to be agreed to and had to be issued as a duty, though it was a sad duty. I would like to make the position very clear at the outset that it was not a pleasant choice. But really speaking, there was no other choice. And when I make this statement, certainly I shall have to state the facts and point out how the whole

thing had developed. It is much better to see this decision in the context of the events that led to it. One of the Members has asked why it is that the Governor had waited for so many days after the announcement of the results of the elections on the 25th or the 28th February. Naturally, the Governor had to wait till the 28th February, when the previous Assembly had to be dissolved. It was only on the 28th February that the previous Government resigned and it was only after the resignation and after the dissolution of the old Assembly that the Governor could start the process of forming a new government.

If we look to the results—this question of arithmetic that is raised very often, namely 89 versus 83 is very interesting certainly, but—the picture of the election results as it has emerged makes it very clear that no political party had absolute majority as a result of the elections. That fact has to be conceded because it is a fact. Whether one likes it or not, it is a fact. Some people have tried to interpret it as a defeat of the Congress. If it is a defeat of the Congress, certainly the Congress will accept it as a defeat. In many other States where the Congress was defeated in the sense that the other parties had a majority, we certainly accepted the defeat. But in the case of Rajasthan, it is difficult to accept that the Congress was defeated in that sense, because every other political party was equally defeated and badly defeated too. If we look at the figures of the number of people elected, no party can say that it had a majority, neither the Swatantra Party nor the Jan Sangh nor even the Communist Party because they had only one solitary Member elected to the State Assembly.

Shri S. A. Dange: Who decided the fate.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: He is certainly capable of making such facts. There

is no doubt about it. That really speaking explains that the existence of only one Member can be construed as a majority. Shri S. A. Dange alone can do that, and nobody else can do that.

What is the significance of this? We have to consider one thing that the Governor or any person placed in that position had to take an objective view of the picture that was emerging. If there was a pre-existing coalition—I am deliberately saying this—before the elections, if any party or group of parties had decided to form a United Front, that is understandable. It is an accepted political device. If it had collectively a majority, I can understand it. On that basis also, the pre-existing coalition, in whatever form it might have existed in Rajasthan, had no majority after the elections. Their total strength came to 80.

It was eloquently argued that the Independents had defeated the Congress. I am not prepared to accept that because it was not the Congress alone that the Independents defeated; it was the Swatantra and Jan Sangh as well. They had defeated other political parties, also, not the Congress alone. Therefore, one cannot morally claim that the Independents should sit with the anti-Congress group. They certainly represent their people. In the election results, they had defeated all the political parties in the State. Therefore, one cannot say that they had a natural political claim to sit only against the Congress. Naturally, they had to be treated as individuals, to that extent representatives of their people who elected them. Certainly it is their right.

The position after the election was that one party had 89 members and the other group of parties had a total strength of 80. Then there were these Independents. That was the picture presented to the Governor. He had to make up his mind. Natural-

ly, the Governor called the other leaders. He had discussions with them. He had discussions with the Congress leaders. Possibly he tried to have information about the other people also. In the statement that he has made—I am only making use of the statement that he has made at the press conference that he held on the 4th March . . .

श्री यशपाल सिंह (देहरादून) : मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है। क्या मैं जान सकता हूँ कि माननीय गृह मंत्री ने गवर्नर महोदय से क्या कहा जब उन्होंने यह बयान दिया कि स्वतन्त्र उम्मीदवार निरर्थक हैं। अगर स्वतन्त्र उम्मीदवार निरर्थक हैं तो फिर राष्ट्रपति की पोजीशन क्यों स्वतन्त्र रखी गई है? स्पीकर की पोजीशन क्यों स्वतन्त्र रखी गई है। अगर स्वतन्त्र उम्मीदवार निरर्थक हैं तो वास्टिट्यूशन में उन का एजिजटेंस क्यों माना गया है? क्यों उन की राजस्थान में भ्रवहेलना की गई है? जो हमारा स्पीकर है वह स्वतन्त्र है, निर्दलीय है, हमारा राष्ट्रपति भी निर्दलीय है, तो हमारे गवर्नर महोदय को यह कहने का क्या हक है कि स्वतन्त्र उम्मीदवार निरर्थक हैं?

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order.

Shri P. K. Deo: Is it not a fact that Independents were counted in assessing majority in UP?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: At the present moment, I am discussing Rajasthan because that question has been raised.

Shri P. K. Deo: Different standards apply at different places?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: If we have to discuss UP, we are certainly prepared to do that. But now he must listen to me.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: During the discussion, we mentioned about UP.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am going to deal in my reply with points which I choose.

I was referring to the press conference that the Governor held on the 4th in which he has explained his approach to the problem. Here we must see in what position the Governor was, what his constitutional right was and in what way he was exercising it. It is much better that we consider this very delicate constitutional issue. One should not merely look at it from the party point of view. I would certainly like to assure this hon. House that this Government has looked at this question not from the party point of view at all, but only from the point of view of constitutional propriety. I will explain how we have done that.

Here the Governor was exercising his individual judgment. This is the only occasion he could do so. Otherwise, in other cases, in the normal functioning, he has to act on the advice of the Council of Ministers. But here one Government was out; the other government was in the process of coming into existence. It was the process of the birth of a new government on the basis of the election results. He has expressed his view that it was very difficult for him to accept the Independents as a reliable factor in calculating the strength of the government.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: May I ask if the Independent Members had not sent their consent in writing, that they are going to join the Samyukta Dal, the Opposition bloc?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: That is exactly what I am coming to. In his press conference, he had mentioned about the flexible loyalties of these members because he found that one name was mentioned on this side as well as on the other side. In view of these claims and counter-claims about the Independents, who were supposed to be representatives of the people, it was difficult for the Governor to go by their number in this particular matter.

Shri K. Manoharan: That was none of his business.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Let me have my say. I cannot say whether I can convince him. If he has an open mind, possibly I can.

Shri K. Manoharan: We have an open mind.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am glad to hear that.

15.18 hrs.

[*MR. SPEAKER in the Chair*]

The main point is that naturally he had to go by certain factual position before him. When he had decided not to go by the number of Independents, the only thing he could do was to go by the largest party returned.

It is not for the first time that this has happened. He has made a reference to a precedent, the precedent of Madras where Shri Rajagopalachari was invited to form the Government.

An hon. Member: Do they remember that?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Possibly they may remember. It is a fact that which cannot be disputed.

This is the position he took. One may agree with it or one may not. I can see that some members here may possibly take a different view. If some of them were Governors, possibly they might have taken a different view. That is quite possible. But the question is: are we going to accept the judgment of the Governor in this case or not? That is the main question before us. Only because it is not acceptable to you, you are not going to accept it? It is here that democracy comes in danger. See the constitutional position. This is the delicate fulcrum on which parliamentary democracy functions. Here is a person functioning as head of a State in the process of the birth of a new government. He has to make a certain judgment. It is quite possible that that judgment may be incorrect.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It was a perverse judgment.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: That is a perverse remark, if I can use that word.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You will know how it is perverse.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am conceding that possibly it may be an incorrect judgment. But the Constitution itself has provided the corrective.

Shri K. Manoharan: If the Governor's decision is incorrect, who is to correct it?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I am coming to that. The Constitution itself has provided for it. That is what happens in a parliamentary democracy.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour): You have a dictator in the State.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: If the wrong person was called upon to form the Government, the very next day he has to face the legislature. Only because the Governor had called somebody and only because he has become the Chief Minister and only because he has formed a Council of Ministers, he does not continue to be Chief Minister. He has to face the House and he has to prove that he commands the majority.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: A theoretical argument.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Therefore, it is incumbent on the Governor, while making a selection of the person on whom he is going to call to become the Chief Minister, to see that he is likely to command the majority of the House. It was on that basis that he asked the leader of the largest party in the legislature to form the Government. The whole trouble started on this thing, when the Governor took this, according to me an objective, decision.

Shri K. Manoharan: Objectionable decision.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: According to you, not according to me.

I think all the lovers of democracy must learn one thing. In this process, if there was a mistake, there was a constitutional remedy, it was the duty of those who are interested in the formation of responsible governments and of running the Constitution in a proper spirit, to accept the judgment of the Governor, . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Of an irresponsible Governor.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: . . . force the Government to go and face the legislature.

Shri Piloo Mody: Was this judgment independent of the Centre?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It is in this context that I am mentioning certain facts. Immediately after this decision of the Government, all parties combined, not to form a Government, but to start an agitation. A sangarsh samiti was formed.

श्री मीठालाल (मवा. माधोपूर)
 पोलिस का इन्तज़ाम पहले ही करने की क्यों
 जरूरत पड़ गई ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: They wanted to know what had happened. What has happened between the 4th March and 12th March is very material and is very relevant. A *Sangarsh samiti* was formed, not to run a constitutional government, but to create conditions, to create scenes, to create disturbances.

Shri P. N. Solanki (Kaira): To fight injustice.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It might not have been their intention probably, I quite concede that, the leaders of the group; may not have had the intention, possibly they wanted to have a peaceful demonstration, which is their right, but a person who is not a member of the legislature, a person who a few weeks ago did not belong to any other political party, who really speaks

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

was a Congressman, a very well known person, Kumbha Ram Arya, was asked to lead the *sangarsh samiti* and the whole thing started drifting onwards.

It was after this demonstration started that section 144 was imposed. These people decided to break section 144. A big procession of 10,000 persons was led by the leaders. At one stage there was a talk with the police, the leaders said they did not want mass breach of the order, but there would be some sort of symbolic action. Four or five of them offered themselves and they were arrested, but by symbolic arrest things do not stop. When the people's minds are inflamed by speeches, by slogans, by every type of instigation, and conditions of disturbance started growing in the city of Jaipur . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The Governor is solely responsible

Shri Y. B. Chavan: We saw a rather difficult situation coming I personally saw that it was a dangerous thing which would lead to an uncalled for political situation also. On the 6th and 7th I had some discussions, I invited some leaders to come and have a discussion with me in Delhi I would like to explain what is our intention our attitude in this matter, because the attempt of the no-confidence motion is to prove that we wanted to kill responsible government. On the contrary, we made all efforts to see that a responsible government was formed in Rajasthan

I was very grateful to Maharani Gayatri Devi whom I invited for discussions. She came, and at that very time, another event had taken place. Some of the leaders of the Opposition from the Lok Sabha had called on the President, and they had pointed out that this type of trouble was starting there, so it was much better that some

way was found out. The President suggested to them that it was much better that the Assembly was called earlier. The moment I heard about it, I had consultations with the Chief Minister of Rajasthan and the Governor also, and I wanted to know whether they would be willing to advance the date of the meeting of the legislature. The next morning I met Maharani Gayatri Devi, who is an hon Member of this House, and suggested to her that, instead of starting this type of campaign on the streets of Jaipur and other cities of Rajasthan, it was much better that we created conditions conducive to a peaceful running of government and peaceful holding of the meeting of the legislature. I told her that the Government of Rajasthan was willing to advance the meeting of the legislature. Originally it was supposed to be held on 21st March, they agreed to advance it to the 14th March. When I suggested this Maharani Gayatri Devi made a counter proposal. She said this could be done, the situation in Jaipur could be controlled, but it was necessary that section 144 should be withdrawn. I said in the prevailing conditions it was rather difficult to consider the suggestion, but if she was going to help, to go round and persuade people to give up this type of activity, certainly I would make this suggestion to the Chief Minister of Rajasthan. Immediately I talked to the Chief Minister of Rajasthan and asked him whether he would consider the withdrawal of section 144. I must say it was a rather difficult decision for him, because in the disturbed conditions to withdraw section 144 was a difficult decision, but looking to this possibility that this was going to facilitate normal conditions in Rajasthan and was going to facilitate the holding the legislature's meeting earlier, he took that risk still.

As to what has happened afterwards I do not want to go into detail, because that is a matter for the judicial inquiry to go into, because what happened is certainly very relevant to the inquiry.

about the firing etc. So, I do not want to touch those particular facts.

I have mentioned all these facts to show that there was no question of defeating democracy. There was no question of depriving the Opposition parties of their right of forming a government. If at all they wanted to have a show-down, if I can use that phrase in a constitutional sense, it is better to have a show down on the floor of the House instead of having that on the streets of Jaipur. That shows the attitude of the man. He was certainly exercised because of the rioting, because of the firing etc, but he still persisted in resorting to the right type of measures.

Unfortunately the story did not stop there I was asked many times during the course of the speeches what happened after 7th March. It was all quiet, it was all quiet in the sense that there were no disturbances but there were no disturbances because afterwards strict curfew was imposed and even the army had to be called into the city of Jaipur. But what as the activity of the opposition, some of the opposition leaders, I am not saying all the opposition leaders? Wall posters were distributed all over the city that if at any time this wretched Sukhadia Government was sworn in they would see how it was being sworn in. Telegrams were sent to different places for processions, the type of speeches that were made giving all sorts of threats and creating a condition which would make it impossible for any legislature to meet peacefully or any responsible government to function peacefully—all this is the background in which Mr. Sukhadia decided on the 12th March, and he wrote to the Governor that he still thought that he commanded the majority—somebody can dispute that point, I am only mentioning a fact—but he did not want to take the responsibility of forming the government, because some people were determined to create disturbance, and he did not want the lives of the poor

people sacrificed in this way. It was much better that he did not take the responsibility of forming the government, and he wrote to the Governor declining not the offer but refusing to form the government, though he considered that he was in a majority. (*Interruptions*)

That only shows your dislike of Sukhadia, but that does not prove your point

Again the issue comes; what was the alternative before the Governor? According to the Governor's judgment, Mr. Sukhadia was the right person to form the Government; he sent an invitation to him to form the Government and Mr. Sukhadia in turn wrote him that he commanded a majority but that he did not want to take the responsibility of forming the Government because of certain happenings there. It was naturally the duty of the Governor to take into consideration what happened after the 4th March. Under those circumstances he felt that to invite the opposition leaders to form the Government would be putting a sort of a premium on violence in those disturbed conditions he felt it better to allow the conditions to neutralise. I would like to assure hon. Member Mr. Dange that it was not to suppress anything; it was only with a view to neutralising the situation that the Governor was forced to take certain decisions. The only other alternative before the Governor was to ask the Opposition to form a Government, which he thought would be unwise. So, he made a recommendation to the Government which reached us on the 13th just before we were being sworn in; his view was that Mr. Sukhadia was unable to form the Government which reached us on the 13th to take the responsibility of forming a Government. The Governor said that under those circumstances he could not in all conscience ask the Opposition parties to form the Government.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Has he a conscience?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: If you have a conscience, he has Now, in those circumstances, what was to be done? The legislature was to be convened the next day but it could not be, because there was no Government. The alternatives before us were either to dissolve the assembly or suspend it and create conditions so that ultimately responsible Government might be restored. That is the background of the decision which the Government took. It was a sad and difficult decision but it was a duty for the Government to take such a decision. I have no doubt in my mind that even if Mr Dange was sitting on this side and if he had the same faith in democracy that I had, and if he had the same loyalty to the Constitution that I had he would have taken the same decision.

Shri S. A. Dange: I would have dismissed the Governor.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: That is why I put an 'If'—if he had the same loyalty to the Constitution as I had. Unfortunately you have not got the same loyalty.

Shri S. A. Dange: The Constitution does not prevent the removal of a Governor who is incompetent.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Only because he took a decision not to your liking you consider him incompetent. That is a very arbitrary way of judging very important functionaries under the Constitution, you cannot think of them so lightly.

Shri S. A. Dange: The Home Minister should remember that Dr Sampurnanand was made a Governor after he proved his incompetence in UP.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Mr Dange may well speak of dismissals and namings but those are not the ways of a constitutional democracy; I can understand that it is his way.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bose: Let us hear your answer to Mr. Dange.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: If you have patience, I will give all the answers. The question ultimately comes to this. Our intention was to create conditions in Rajasthan so that a responsible Government can be installed there, our intentions are still the same and this Proclamation is for an interim period. I would therefore request the hon. Members to use the language of restraint which will help us create conditions in Rajasthan so that a responsible Government may be installed. Even today suggestions were thrown about that the Governor should be dismissed that they will fight this and they will fight that. This type of talk is not conducive to the restoration of responsible Government.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: How long would the purchasing of independents continue?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: As I said in the beginning it was a sad duty and we were inspired and motivated only by the consideration of establishing a responsible Government.

Shri Deokinandan Patodia (Jalore): The President's rule was imposed in the background of Mr Sukhadia's refusal to form a Government. Does it mean that as soon as normal conditions are restored he will automatically be invited to form the Government?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Here again, you want me to take that decision and I refuse to take that decision. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the Governor. He must understand the situation and it is the duty of the Governor to assess the situation and act.

श्री कबरवाल गुप्ता मंत्री महोदय के खयाल में आज बहाने पर किस की मंजूरि दी है। जब बह राष्ट्रपति जी के साथ खडे थे, तो क्या उस समय 93 मेम्बर थे या नही ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I refuse to be cross-examined like this (interruptions).

श्री श्रीकांतः १८ तारीख के हिन्दुस्तान में, लिखा था कि जब राजस्थान के राज्यपाल यहाँ से जयपुर लौटे, तो हवाई ब्रह्मे से राजभवन तक उन के स्वागत के लिए तेरह हजार शकस्त पुलिसमैन खड़े थे।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The basis on which the no-confidence motion has been tabled is completely misconceived. It is rather an unusual decision but it had to be taken to save the democratic form of Government in Rajasthan. We wanted that the people should have the right to form their Government as early as possible and run the administration of Rajasthan. That is exactly the purpose. The basis on which this no-confidence motion has been tabled is misconceived and misleading and has possibly arisen out of the political hostility to this Government. I could see that from the speeches. Other Members instead of confining themselves to the issue of Rajasthan, went to the right and to the left and found fault with the Government.

An hon. Member: Where are you?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: At the Centre. The last speech I heard was very interesting. I can find the real reason for this no-confidence motion. It is not only Rajasthan; it is something else which is troubling them. The hon. Member Mr. Dange has mentioned many other points. He does not like the Government. The Members there do not like the success of the Government at the Centre here or the Congress Party. Taking a general view of the election results, we never thought that we were going to be the monopolist party in this country. We have accepted the rules of the game. I think the Congress at least has a better claim than the present form of elections and the present form of the Constitution was their gift to the country.

Shri P. N. Solanki: It is the right of the people; it is not your gift.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Because the Congress represents the entire-people.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: That Congress is dead now.

Shri P. N. Solanki: After independence you thought that anarchy would set in.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: When I said 'gift of the Congress Party', the Congress represented the entire people... (*Interruptions*). When we were not in at these elections, we were not sad. After the elections, when we were in the process of getting results and knowing the defeat of one Congressman after another, I was asked for my reaction in one sentence and I said: I am sorry that the Congress was defeated, but, I am proud that the country has done well. Maybe, we were defeated here or there... This is a large election; we were defeated here and there. (*Interruption*) Not everywhere. We were not defeated everywhere. The proof is that we are sitting here, and you do not like that. Therefore, you have moved a no-confidence motion (*Interruption*) This is proof, that we are sitting here. Wherever you have your own government, run them properly; do service to the people. We all want to do service to the people. Let the people judge. You ask and let the country develop. Let the progress of the people, the march of the people's progress go ahead. We are not bothered about whether one party remains or the other party remains. It is not that.

The hon. Member Shri Dange said, and that is very important, that he has got one Member in Rajasthan but he is supporting it because of tactics. I hope his speech was also one of tactics. When everything becomes tactics, one does not know what the strategy, what the philosophy behind it is. What is the positive approach to the problem? He made mention of me. He said that I am a big question mark. I am so proud that I am still a question-mark to Shri Dange. They

[Shri Y. B. Chavan]

have the habit of trying to put down any party and individual to a formula. I am very glad that Shri Dange has not yet found a formula for me. I have some hope of succeeding as Home Minister. My party knows me; my leader knows me, and I am sure my country knows me. (Interruption). I am a humble servant of this country I am a humble follower of my leader. I stand for democracy; I stand for progress; I stand for the welfare of the people. My people know me very well. If nobody can reduce me to any formula, I am very glad about it. But this Government has got a philosophy of its own; it has an approach of its own. Through thick and thin, and in difficult times, we stand by that philosophy.

One saddest speech I heard. And that was the speech of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. He is not present here today. Why do I say that it was a sad, rather tragic speech? It is not what he said: I am not going to say about that. He is one of those leaders which my generation held in esteem. In the 1940s and 1942s, we looked up for a second line of leadership after Pandit Nehru, and we were looking up to Dr. Lohia, Shri Jai Prakash Narain and other people. We have respect for them; we worshipped them at that time. We worshipped, as young men those leaders.

An Hon. Member: Masam also.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Unfortunately no. I heard the speech of Dr. Lohia, which he made yesterday. He said:

“म चक्रा दुःखं” I thought it was in a physical sense, and I was rather sad. But then he said in the next sentence, which is a very eloquent sentence—a rather tragic utterance. He said that a big fort is being destroyed, but there is nothing to replace it. That is the tragedy of it; with all the experience, with all his intelligence, with all capabilities and devotion, he has only learnt to destroy and not to create. He was very happy that the Congress was defeated. If that is the

only consolation you have in mind, woe will befall the country. Destroy the Congress if you want and if you can. But what is there to substitute it? (Interruption) Coalition? You are going to substitute coalition? Look here, my friends from the Swatantra party. You may be very happy and I will certainly make an appeal to Shri Dange; it may help him as a tactician in Rajasthan. But what is the picture for the future?

Shri S. A. Dange: Substitute in Kerala, Tamil Nad, West Bengal, Bihar.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I wish you well very well; you have your Government and I wish you well. I have no doubt about it. But what is this? Is this something that you are going to substitute?

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी असेज भी यही करता था ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Therefore, what I say is this. I appeal to the people through this House; what is the result, the sum-total of the elections of 1967? That possibly you are trying to destroy something, but we are not trying to substitute or reconstruct something. Dr. Lohia's speech was something on the same line, a negative line, this substitute line. He made rather an unfortunate reference to the late Prime Minister Nehru, with reference to a foreign exchange account in London or somewhere. He also made mention of the then Finance Minister and the present Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai. Shri Morarji Desai had never visited any bank nor checked any accounts. There was no necessity of doing it. It was a completely false statement.

Some hon. Members: Shame shame.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Then about Panditji's account, I think sometime before, this information may have been given, but I would like to give

certain information now about it. Panditji had royalty account with his publisher and literary agent in London from 1936. All the royalties due to him on his books from the foreign publishers were credited to his account. As in 1947, Panditji had £3,864.1 and the dues and other accruals, since then have been repatriated to India. The monies were repatriated to India as and when required by him. The question of rules, etc., or regulations on foreign exchange, came into existence after Independence, and immediately after that, the whole accounting procedure was subjected to regulations as existed from time to time. So, there was no question of having any very large amount. Naturally, Panditji was not merely the Prime Minister of this country; he was not merely the leader of this country. He was something plus. He was always a leader of humanity and was accepted as a thinker in the world. Crores of people in the country wanted to know how Panditji thought, how he wrote, how he spoke and reacted. Therefore, his writings and speeches were looked at with some respect as we Indians were looking at. And therefore his books were sold in different parts of the world. His publisher had naturally some credits but they were completely subject to regulations, the foreign exchange regulations.

Why I mentioned it is this: this is an attitude of pathological obsession to certain persons and personalities. It is rather very tragic. It is wrong to have this obsession; it is a very tragic thing for the man concerned. I would request Dr. Lohia to realise this. We all have regard for him; he may talk ill of A or B or C. But we still have regard for him. Why think in terms of trying to do damage, do damage to the reputation of one big man?

Dr. Lohia again made mention of our present Prime Minister. He made that rather unfortunate, may I say, indecent reference to the necklace. The hon. Member, Shri Dange made a reference to the necklace, may be his move was a tactical one. I do not know. (*Interruption*).

Shri S. A. Dange: I said I am not bothered about it.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: That means you have accepted it. You are not bothered about it. That means you have accepted that version.

Shri S. A. Dange: I did not care about it. (*Interruption*).

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Really, as an important leader, as a leader on the floor of the House, I think it was his duty as and when to oppose politically to oppose from a political angle the election or otherwise. We are prepared to stand on merit. If we are not proved by merit, we are prepared to be rejected and thrown away. It does not matter. But this personal attack by creating an image, a slur, is nothing but a game of character assassination.

One of my friends said "we attacked some persons here and they were defeated." This process of deceiving the people, of creating confusion, putting up rather a distorted image of the people and trying to mislead the people at large, and trying to achieve political results out of it is something which is not consistent with the idea of democracy, the idea of decent life that I have understood. I think I have tried to answer the general points raised. I do not want to meet every point that was raised.

I would only submit that we stand by the commitments that we have made. Whatever party has a majority, we will support them and give them our constructive cooperation. We wish them well.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: What about Rajasthan?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I have already said, you will all help this Government and the Governor of Rajasthan to create normal conditions there.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: When Mr. Mohanlal Shukhadia told the Governor on the 13th March that even though

[Shrimati Gayatri Devi]

he had a majority, he would not like to form a Government in Rajasthan, why then did not the Governor invite the leader of the Samyukta Dal, who then had a clear majority, to form the Government, instead of imposing President's rule in a high-handed, dictatorial fashion?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I have explained everything, but unfortunately she was not present. I am prepared to discuss this matter with her outside.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: Other members say you did not answer this particular point

Shri Y. B. Chavan: The time is nearing five o'clock. The Prime Minister has to speak and the hon. mover of the motion also has to speak. I have explained the circumstances under which this Proclamation had to be issued. I have explained the political attitude and the political philosophy behind it. I would request the House that this misconceived and misleading motion of no confidence should be rejected.

Shri P. Ramamurthi: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the House has just now heard the lengthy explanation given by the hon. Home Minister. Even after hearing it, I cannot but remark that no amount of chicanery and sophistry will be able to hide the fact that as far as the sorry episode of Rajasthan is concerned, there has been a conspiracy in which the Central Government has played a major part, a conspiracy entered into between the Central Government, the Congress President and the Rajasthan Governor, who himself is nothing but a Congressman. Any amount of blind attempt to whitewash this conspiracy will not do.

The Home Minister has really attempted what in legal language is called *suppressio veri*. He suppressed some important relevant facts to show that his case was correct. In a no-confidence motion, I would certainly like to talk about many other matters, but

just now I am confining myself to the Rajasthan episode. I need not go into the number of members that different parties have got. But I want to point out certain major facts. Yesterday my friend, Mr. Shantilal Shah, was waxing eloquent talking like a high pontiff that people who have been elected on a particular ticket or as independents should not go to other parties, and this is something very immoral. I would have given him some credence if he was not speaking from the Congress benches there. Every day right from 1952 the Congress Party has been doing nothing but this. In 1952 in Madras the Congress did not get the requisite majority. The first thing they did was to seduce the Commonwealth Party and their leader and the Toilers' Party into the Congress. Right from that day Mr. Shantilal Shah has been continuing to be a member of that party. If his moral indignation is roused against this, why is he continuing to be a member of that party? Even today in Rajasthan what are they doing? It was reported that one member of the Swatantra Party after election had joined the Congress. Mr. Shukhadia counted him also to show that he has a majority. Another member of the Congress Party left and came to this side. So, for nearly 4 or 5 days this horse-trading was going on in which the Congress played a major role. So, let us not have these moralising things on the floor of this House. Mr. Sukhadia thought he could form a ministry. On the 2nd, he issued a statement to the Press—*Hindustan Times* had quoted him—stating categorically that he has not been able to get the requisite majority and therefore the Governor has no alternative but to invite the opposition leader to form a ministry. But then something happened. Mr. Kamraj entered the field. He is, after all the Congress boss and we know what sort of Governor Dr. Sampuranand is, who said that it is necessary for the Congress party to be returned to power to have stability in this country. We know his partisan stand. Mr. Kamraj order-

ed him saying that whatever Mr. Sukhadia might say, he got to invite the leader of the largest party, which is the Congress. Mr. Kamaraj is the Constitutional interpreter and he advises the Governor. Immediately the Governor comes to the conclusion that Mr. Sukhadia has got a majority. In coming to this conclusion, unfortunately facts stare him in the face! Therefore, he says, "I cannot count the independents" If he had the power, I am sure he would have said, "When the Assembly meets, the independents will not count. They do not have the right to vote. We will go only by the parties" Unfortunately, the Constitution did not allow him to do that! Therefore, in coming to that judgment, he allowed Mr. Kamaraj to dictate to him, hoping that in the interval, it would be possible for the man who has been invited to form a ministry to seduce some more people and somehow or other show a majority. This was the understanding and expectation. Mr. Sukhadia also went about doing that.

On the 13th something else happened. It is true they advanced the date of the meeting of the Assembly. But the Central Government had other views. The Central Government thought obviously that Mr. Sukhadia was living in a fool's paradise and he would not get a majority. All this conjuring up by the Governor that an unmanageable law and order situation would develop if the Assembly had continued its business on the 15th is nothing but a figment of imagination. After all, despite its big name of being called President's rule, it is after all the Congress Party's rule. The Congress Party wanted to reimpose its rule. Why did they not call the Assembly? The Home Minister said that they want to create a situation where law and order will be maintained and then they will have the democratic process. I am absolutely certain that the law and order situation will be considered good the moment Mr. Sukhadia is assured of a majority. That is what they are waiting for. In order to manoeuvre for

that, all this talk of law and order situation is brought in. After all, the States have managed much worse law and order situations in this country. As Mr. Manoharan and Mr. Dange pointed out, there have been worse situations in the country when bullocks had been used and the military had been called, but no State ministry was dismissed and President's rule imposed there.

16 hrs.

Therefore, Sir, all these questions come up, these questions of majority party and all that, when it concerns the Congress Party. In 1952 they did the same thing in Madras, but when it came to Kerala in 1965, no such rule was raised. It was said that the majority party was there, the major party was there, the first major party was there and it had the support of all other parties, but unfortunately it was not the Congress Party. Therefore, why should that party be called? This is their game.

No amount of chicanery, as I said, can hide this fact. This is a definite conspiracy, a conspiracy into which the Congress President himself along with the Central Government and the Governor of Rajasthan has entered in order to get back the Congress Party in power firstly through the President and later on through the legislature. It is this that they are doing.

Shri Khadilkar was talking about the mandate of the Congress Party and all that. What is the mandate that the Congress Party has received, I would like to ask. They must have a sense of responsibility, a sense of shame even now. Unfortunately, they seem to have lost all sense of shame. After all, the one central issue on which the Congress Party went to the people, the one issue which was highlighted by all the Opposition parties, despite the differences they may have among themselves, was whether the policy of the Congress Party, its philosophy, its programme, its activities, have got the confidence of the people, whether the people supported them. It is on that

[Shri P. Ramamurthi]

central issue that the entire elections were fought throughout the country. To that central issue the answer of the people is a decisive "No". The people have said: "No, we do not agree with your policies". 39 per cent of the people have voted for you on this specific question.

Shri Khedika (Khed): They have voted us by a decisive majority.

Shri P. Ramamurthi: 39 per cent of the people have voted for you. And, how did they vote for you? I would like to go into that. You had the State machinery. You utilised the State machinery. Here is the Prime Minister who went to Madurai, Tiruchirappalli and addressed election meetings and the meetings were organised by the District Collector. I am speaking without any chance of being opposed because the District Collector had admitted it. Later on Shri Kamaraj came out with a statement that he had asked the District Collector to send the bill to the Congress Party. Will you allow me to write to the District Collector and ask him to arrange a public meeting for the Opposition parties? What else is it if it is not utilisation of the State machinery simply because you are the Prime Minister? In many other ways the State machinery has been utilised. What did they do in Tripura? The entire budget for six months you did not spend. Suddenly it was spent. What did you do with that money? The entire money was spent according to the dictates of Congress M.L.A.'s so that they could come back (*Interruption*). These facts may be unpalatable to you, but facts have to be conceded.

An hon. Member: You are distorting them.

Shri P. Ramamurthi: Hold an inquiry. I am prepared for that. But you dare not have an inquiry. What did they do with all that money?

What I say is, the entire State machinery has been utilised. What about rowdyism? We were extremely sorry when we heard that the Prime

Minister's meeting was disturbed and a stone was thrown at her. I would like to know how many murders were committed in the course of these elections by Congress men of Opposition party leaders and workers. We know how Shri Madhu Limave, a distinguished Member of this House, was attempted to be murdered during the election. We know that in our own State, when comrade Umamaheswarar was addressing a meeting, his meeting was sought to be broken by Congress goondas. We know that a Communist Party worker was murdered in his very constituency, and a DMK worker was murdered. We know in Andhra how many people have been murdered. All these things are there on record. . . . (*Interruptions*). People were murdered in many cases during the elections. I can give the names of the people who were murdered in the course of election campaign. In Kerala was it not in Kayamkulam that a Communist Party worker was murdered during the election campaign? This is the sort of democracy we have.

What about the money? Are you prepared to render to the people an open statement of the total amount of money that you received from big business houses in this country, both from the companies as well as blackmarket unaccounted money that has come to the coffers of the Congress Party? With all this you conducted the election. I know how the election was conducted. We know, for example, how in Kashmir nomination papers of 39 people were declared invalid. . . . (*Interruptions*). And yet you call this a democracy, and this is what is called "free and fair" elections. Then the words "unfairness and unfreedom" have no meaning in your dictionary.

If you are prepared to conduct the elections not on the basis of the money that you received from these big business houses, if you are prepared to conduct the elections without utilising the official machinery for bribing the people, for intimidating the voters, for

intimidating the people, if you are prepared to conduct the elections without using the castes and communities as you did in the last elections, then I am absolutely certain that the majority that you have there will be dwindled into a minority. That is the real situation in the country. Even for the election of the Prime Minister, we have it from the authority of the Deputy Prime Minister that the big business houses had a hand in it. If about the election of the Prime Minister it is said like that, we can understand how much big business houses had a hand in the election for the entire country. That is what is happening in the country.

Then we are asked to believe that, after all it is the judgment of a Governor, you have to accept the judgment of a Governor. Then, why is the Central Government there for? It is not simply for the purpose of dittoing whatever the Governor says. Here we know that the Central Government is itself a party to that decision. We know that Shri Sadiq Ali was despatched on the 13th. He had a talk with Shri Sukhadia and also with the Governor. The conspiracy comes in this way.

Therefore, I want to point out that I am supporting this resolution of no confidence, on behalf of my group, for this simple reason. I am not going to the other questions, although I agree, for example, with Shri Manoharan, with regard to the relations between the States and the Centre, the nature of the Constitution, the farcical federal structure and the reality of the unitary structure; I agree with all that, and I certainly agree also on the question of language, which we have been raising in our legislatures; we agree with all of them. But I do not raise those questions just now. Just now I support the resolution of no confidence on behalf of my group for the simple reason that we cannot trust this government to be a democratic government because it functions in a way which is anti-democratic and

anti-people. The acid test is the case of Rajasthan. If you are really prepared to abide by the verdict of the people, then, in that case, call the Assembly immediately. Peace and order can be maintained if you are prepared to do that. Otherwise, the only conclusion that we can draw is that you want to cling to power by manoeuvring.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend, Shri Vajpayee, moved this motion of no confidence, I was not very enthusiastic about it. I thought that we should have probably waited for some time to sponsor a no confidence motion. But, after hearing the Home Minister, who delivered a one hour speech, rather inflicted that speech, on this House, I am fully convinced that the Central Government deserves such a motion on the very first day of the session.

I do not want to go into the details of what has happened nor do I want to repeat what my hon. friends have already spoken, but one thing is very clear. Too long this party, by enjoying power without any strong alternative or opposition to it, has treated the Constitution, the State and the Government machinery for the advantage and convenience of the party as if the party and the Constitution are synonymous. They have not learnt the lessons. Therefore they are repeating these things. These people owe allegiance to the Constitution and swear loyalty to it but every act that they do is unconstitutional and against the canons of democracy. It is no wonder therefore that they had been beaten in their own coin. We find today that the people have registered their no-confidence in them, but by chance they have a majority here. But wherever they have been able to form the government, the loyalty to the Constitution, that spirit, is not there. We find the picture in Haryana, in Pondicherry and I do not know when this picture you will find here. This party has violated the Constitution. They only

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

distribute among themselves the loaves and fishes. Once that goes, there is no loyalty left; then there is no party, no machinery, nothing of the kind.

Coming to the question of Rajasthan, the Home Minister took great pains to explain the delicate constitutional position. As I said, I do not want to go into the facts, but I have reasons to believe that all that has happened in Rajasthan has been after consultation with the Central Government.

An hon. Member: No.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: It is not the Governor's own independent action. A Governor, like Shri Sampurnanand, who is a cent per cent Congressman, would not dare take this action. He is telling us about the Constitution. I have read this Constitution thrice and my friends must have read it several times. I want to know where in the Constitution it is embodied that the Governor's report would be final so far as the President and the Central Government are concerned. It is stated here that if a situation arises, the law and order position is such that the constitutional machinery cannot work, the President, if he is satisfied, on the report of the Governor or otherwise—and it does not say it is binding—the President may etc. It is very clearly stated in article 356.

Now, did they solely rely on the Governor's report? Shri Chavan would have a case here if he had stated, "After all, we are a constitutional government; we want to respect the wishes of the Constitution; the Governor occupies a very crucial position there and we cannot just go against the wishes of the Governor there." If that is so, that should be accepted whatever report the Governor had given. But did the Governor not give the report, which he has admitted in the course of his

statement—that he want _____ resolution of the Assembly? He probably felt that there could be no constitutional government whatsoever. It was a wrong judgment.

They apply double standards. Again I say and repeat that word. What is the standard? What is the constitutional requirement, I want to know. You have two standards. He is talking of independents defeating all parties. Independents also defeated the Congress. The ruling party was defeated. Did the independents not defeat the Congress in Uttar Pradesh? What was the instruction? Who is to interpret the Constitution? How is the Governor to be satisfied? In the Constitution there is no mention that the leader of the majority party or that party would be called. The Constitution only says that the Governor, if he is satisfied that a particular person can command a majority, will call him to form the government. There is no question of a single party or a majority party. So far as we are concerned, we are a country with a multi-party system.

You say about conventions. But we have a written Constitution. It should be our guiding line. You want to utilise the Constitution in your favour when it suits you. The independents there met the Governor who ascertained their wishes whether they preferred the Congress Party or not. After ascertaining the wishes of the Independents the Governor of Uttar Pradesh called the leader of the Congress Party to form the Government. And here, if the Independents had been called by the Governor to tell him to which party or which leader they would like to give support in the formation of the Government, probably, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend here—they had already given their consent in writing—the Governor would have been obliged to call the leader of the Samyukta Dal to form the Government. To avert that, he conveniently ignored the Independents.

Here is the Central Government. Who is to interpret this? What is the legal machinery? I am told that the Governor of Uttar Pradesh kept the Advocate-General sitting by his side so that he could get the legal advice. I want to know whether there are any legal instructions, if any, to those Governors in cases of such serious nature. After all, our people have voted; once in five years they get a chance. They have registered their opinion and that has to be respected. If the Constitution does not provide such things, if such a Constitution is not adequate, then damn, with this Constitution. (Interruption) I say, amend this Constitution. If you misinterpret it . . .

An hon Member: You have taken oath to it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Yes. I have taken oath to it. Don't misunderstand me. But the Constitution will mean nothing if it does not provide all this.

Shri N. P. Chengalraya Naidu (Chittoor): I rise on a point of order. Is it proper for the hon. Member to say, 'damn the Constitution'?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If he wants; I can withdraw that word 'damn'. I do not mind it. I did not mean that way. You take out that impression from your mind. What I want to impress upon this Parliament is that if this Constitution does not provide any remedy for a situation in which the people have registered their opinion, their desires and aspirations, and if we do not provide any machinery to implement their desires and aspirations, then this Constitution is not sufficient for our country. That is what I wanted to make out. It is not a question of U.P. and Rajasthan alone. In years to come, we have to face this contingency. There may not be a single party anywhere. The Congress Party, in the next elections, will be reduced to nothing. They may not have the absolute majority anywhere to form the Government.

There maybe a number of small parties who may not be individually in a position to come in a majority anywhere to form the Government. How will the President decide? How will the Governor decide? We have to think of these contingencies and such situations. Our Constitution has visualised this. Therefore, it has not specifically mentioned that the leader of the majority Party should be called to form the Government. It has only laid down that the Governor must call a person, a member, who says he can command the majority.

The real test was to immediately call the Assembly. Mr. Chavan may avoid this. Mr. Chavan may not accept this. But the fact remains that at the nick of the moment, not because of law and order problem, when Mr. Sukhadia thought that he was facing the Assembly and that even for a day he could not carry on the Government because the majority was against him, he conveniently said that he could not take the responsibility and the Governor was there for him and the President and Mr. Chavan were here to oblige him. He is ever-ready. There is a dishonest motive behind it because they want to bide time. We have given an opportunity to the Assembly Members to vote for the election of the President. It is because they want to bide time. These people will get exhausted and they will get exasperated. That is what will happen to the Members of the Assembly. After fighting elections once in a period of five years, nobody, not even any of us in this Parliament, although we may say that this Government will toppled in so many days and so on, no Member either in the legislature or in Parliament, would like that the Assemblies or Parliament should be dissolved immediately; nobody would desire that. Therefore, Government want to keep them in suspense. That is why they have suspended the Assembly. Meanwhile, the people will become exasperated and ultimately through machinations they will try their best again. We are very familiar with those things

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

in this country. They will try to catch hold of some weaklings, and then Shri Sukhadia will come out from the hospital and say 'Sir, I am now in a position to form the Government'. That is what they are trying to achieve. They are murdering democracy. Shri Y. B. Chavan should remember that there are parties and they are political forces in the country, which believe in democracy; I quite agree with him that in this country no political party and no political force which believes in violence and which does not believe in constitutional and peaceful change has any place or will ever have any place. The roots of democracy are well laid in this country and we are on sound foundation. The results of the elections have shown that we have brought about a peaceful and constitutional revolution which hundreds of violent revolutions would not have achieved. That is what the people of our country have achieved in these elections, and we have to respect that.

Therefore, if really the Central Government have any respect for the Constitution, if they really want to create an atmosphere in this country where people would have faith and confidence in the peaceful order of change, then they should be prepared to admit that mistake. There should be no question of prestige at all. I hope that the Prime Minister when she replies to the debate would have the courage to say 'A mistake has been committed and we are now correcting ourselves'. By correcting themselves, they will be creating a new precedent in this House. I hope that the Prime Minister will do so. Let us all respect the Constitution. If she says that, then I can assure you that we might agree not to press this motion.

I read in the papers this morning that Government are not lifting this Proclamation so soon. They are going to wait till the retirement of Dr. Sampurnanand on the 15th April or so, because they have made Dr. Sampurnanand

nanand a scape-goat and they want to keep up his prestige and honour. That is why they want to wait till then. Otherwise, they can take action any time they like. But I would agree, and I think my hon. friend Shri Vajpayee and all others would agree to withdraw this motion, if the Prime Minister says that 'It is a mistake; we have committed a mistake; we have not honoured the Constitution; we have not done a service to democracy; therefore, we are going to revoke this; normal conditions have prevailed in Rajasthan, the Assembly will be called, and the constitutional machinery will be set to work, and a Ministry will be set up and the leader of the Samyukta Dal would be called upon to form a government.'

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Mr Speaker, Sir, no-confidence motions have become such a routine that we are not, at any rate, I am not bothered by their frequency except that by their repeated and unsuccessful use their utility will be blunted

May I pick up Shri Surendranath Dwivedy where he ended? It is very interesting to listen to speeches here because in each hon. Member's speech one has a glimpse of how he would function in a particular situation, and unfortunately they view our actions in that light. We heard from Shri S. A. Dange a particular exposition; we heard from another Member, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, another type of exposition, which shows the standards which they may use or they maintain. Similarly, we hear the motive attributed to the Congress Party; it may be that those are the motives that their parties have or would have if they were placed in a similar situation. Fortunately, the Congress Party does not suffer from all these things. And what is the proof? The proof is that today, after being in full power, we still have brought this country to a stage where in many States there are Governments of a non-Congress

nature, either headed by separate parties or by coalitions. This in itself is proof that we do not want to cling to power, that we do not want to act undemocratically.

An hon. Member: That is in spite of yourselves.

Prof. Samar Guha (Contai): That is because of the grace of the Congress Party, but due to the Constitution.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: By the fact that the Congress Party allowed the Constitution to work (*Interruptions*). I am saying 'allowed' because there are parties in other countries which have a constitution where they have adopted other methods, where they have not functioned like this. This has happened in many countries in the world. So this is not an aspect that we can ignore nor is it good for us to ignore it.

I do not want to go into the details of the Rajasthan situation, because many Members have spoken about it. The constitutional points were very ably dealt with by Shri Shah and Shri Khadilkar; Shri Pahadia gave us the details of the situation. Many other Members have dealt with those points and last, but not least, the Home Minister went into great detail and dealt with the matter in a most able manner. So I do not want to go into those issues again.

But I do want to draw your attention to this fact that today there is a changed situation in India. But it is not a sudden change. We seem to think that because there was an election, a sudden change has come about. This change has been a gradual one; it has been coming about little by little, not only in every election, but even in between elections. We have been watching the change coming over the people and we have been consistently saying that these are the growing pangs of democracy, that these are the roots which democracy is striking down in

our country. And we have encouraged this.

I do not say that in some places there may not have been mistakes. There may have been people who do not want to encourage it. Of course, that must also have happened. But by and large, taking this vast country and its vast population, we have encouraged these forces of democracy. And today we see an entirely new situation.

One of the first things that I did was to extend my hand of cooperation and friendship to the non-Congress Chief Ministers of certain States. I am very happy to say that they responded in a like manner and they have assured me that we can cooperate together. It is not an easy situation, because not only is the economic situation difficult, the food situation difficult but the whole complexity of this new situation is there. But we will not fail for want of trying. That is the utmost we can say on this issue.

So I think it is extremely unfair of Members of the Opposition to pick out one instance where things have not gone smoothly. Everywhere else, where there are non-Congress Governments, the transition has been a very smooth and even speedy one. I wish it had been so in Rajasthan also.

There were certain conditions due to which this could not take place. In their speeches, Opposition Members seemed to imply that we intend for all time to have President's rule in Rajasthan or to prevent the Opposition from coming in if they had a majority, which is not so at all. The Home Minister has made it very clear. There were certain conditions created, conditions of violence.

Now, one may agree with the Governor or not. You may agree with what he did or you may not. But the answer is not to take that quarrel out in the streets of Jaipur.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

This is the only question. I am not blaming any particular person or any particular party. As I told the Maharani when she phoned to me, this is something which when one starts sometimes goes out of control. But a situation did arise where it was felt that it might not be manageable; it could have been that nothing might have happened. But had we not acted, had certain incidents taken place afterwards on the 14th, resulting in firing, loss of life and so on, again Opposition members would have been the first to accuse us and say 'You should have foreseen this. Why did you not take prompt action?'

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: The hon. Prime Minister just now said that this quarrel should not be taken out into the streets, that she was not saying that it was provoked by anybody, who provoked it, but I have tried to make it clear that whatever the official version is, eye witnesses and the people on the spot know that it was the police who fired. As I have said in my speech, why were the police there, two hours after section 144 was withdrawn?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: The Governor has instituted a judicial inquiry in which all these things will come out. We are all interested to know what is the truth of the matter, but until the report of the inquiry comes out I think it is not right really to lay the blame on one side or another. That is why I did not say anything more about that particular issue.

But I would like to say how deeply grieved I am at the loss of life in Jaipur, and I would like to express my very deep sympathy for the families of those who have lost their lives.

One thing more. Many types of monopolies are talked about in this House. I would like to assure all hon. Members that the Congress Party does not seek a monopoly of power, nor does it think that it has

a monopoly of wisdom; in fact, we are opposed to monopolies of all kinds, feudal monopolies, economic monopolies, personal or family monopolies, and even the distressing monopoly of shouting and interrupting of some sections of this House.

As I said, what has happened in Rajasthan has greatly distressed us, and it is unfortunate that things developed in this way.

One charge was made by, I think, Mr. Ramamurti, which I must meet, which is that my meetings were arranged by the Government. There are certain security reasons, which I must confess that personally consider entirely unnecessary, but unfortunately there are certain rules here about security and it is this security aspect which is dealt with by the District Magistrate. He does not organise meeting or anything like that, but even the cost of this is always borne by the party.

Shri P. Ramamurti: On a point of information.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I am not yielding now, because there is no time at all.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): The District Collector admitted it.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: As I said, in six States today we have non-Congress ministries, and in three of these States the Congress has not lost, the number of Congressmen elected in the Assembly is very much larger than any other single party; nowhere else in the world would that be called a defeat or a loss, it is only here perhaps because you measure it with what the strength was before, that you think that it is a defeat in actual fact it is, you could say, a lessening of the votes, but it is certainly not a defeat. Where there are these non-Congress Governments, we intend to function as responsible and disciplined opposition, working

only for the good of the State. Actually, in Rajasthan also, as you very well know, the Congress is the largest single party. Anyway. I do not want to go into all those matters, and the time also is exceedingly short. I would like to express the earnest hope that at the earliest possible there would be a peaceful atmosphere in Rajasthan....

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: There is.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: so that responsible government can be formed as everywhere else in the country, and whichever group or party has majority will be asked to assume this responsibility.

I would beg of all hon. Members of this House to look ahead in the spirit of true faith in democracy.

One point was mentioned by the Maharani, which was that we were afraid because of some enquiry which might be held. You all know that this matter has been discussed in this House, and the Administrative Reforms Commission has made certain recommendations regarding such allegations. We are very anxious to implement these, and we are going into the matter. We had taken it up with the State Governments earlier. Now, of course, we shall discuss the matter with the new Chief Ministers. We do not want to sleep on this matter; we want to take it up, to see that there is some regular machinery which can go into these allegations, both at the Centre and in the State. So, let us join hands in order to create conditions which would enable us to revoke the President's Proclamation and restore responsible Government in Rajasthan at the earliest possible date. That is what I said in my broadcast. I assure you that that is what I genuinely feel. It is now a question of all of us trying to work together. Earlier we were always the Government and most of you were on the other side, in the Opposition. Now we are both the

Government and the Opposition in a way in different places. Therefore, unless we try to work together, especially where there is a difficult situation, it will not be easy to have smooth functioning and to find a way out of the many problems and difficulties which our country faces. I sincerely hope that we will be able to create this atmosphere of working together and having normal conditions all over the country.

I add one small piece of information which I hope the House would be interested in some hon. Members sitting opposite also suggested that we might have President's rule in that State.

An hon. Member: Who said?.... (Interruptions).

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Shri Balraj Madhok, among others.

Shri Balraj Madhok (South Delhi): It is good that she has raised this point. When curfew was imposed in Rajasthan, we got reports from there that because of the curfew the opposition leaders could not move about and that they were almost prisoners in their own houses whereas Mr. Sukhadia and his partymen were going about....

Shri A. B. Vajpayee:in police jeeps.

Shri Balraj Madhok:and trying to purchase independents, intimidating others and offering bribes to some. This was a situation which was very unfair to the Opposition. So, we said to them: You lift the curfew or do not allow Mr. Sukhadia and his partymen who have lost the majority to continue with the Government of the state and to go on using the official machinery and official authority for wrong purpose and to stab democracy; therefore, lift the curfew or impose President's rule and remove Mr. Sukhadia from power. That is what we said; we stand by that statement.

Shrimati Gayatri Devi: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister one question? She was good enough to say that any allegations against the Ministers would be looked into. I want to know if the hon. Prime Minister is aware that about 18 months ago, the Opposition M.Ps. and M.L.As. of Rajasthan presented a memorandum to her predecessor containing some allegations against the Chief Minister, Mr. Sukhadia, and that nothing has happened to that though we had an assurance from the then Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri that he would look into them?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I said that we were considering the machinery to look into those allegations.

Mr. Speaker: There are only fifteen minutes left. If Mr. Vajpayee could conclude in about ten minutes, we can go on now. Or we can take this up tomorrow.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी. अध्यक्ष महोदय, जिन सदस्यों ने इस प्रस्ताव पर भाषण दिये हैं, मैं उन्हें धन्यवाद देता हूँ। जिन्होंने प्रस्ताव का समर्थन किया है, मैं उन का भी आभारी हूँ और जिन्होंने विरोध किया है, मैं उन को भी धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

यह पूछा गया है कि क्या राजस्थान का प्रश्न इतना बड़ा प्रश्न था कि जिस के ऊपर नये मंत्रिमंडल के खिलाफ भविष्यवास का प्रस्ताव पेश किया जाता। कांग्रेस के सदस्यों के लिए राजस्थान एक छोटा सा मसला ही सकता है, लेकिन हमारे लिए राजस्थान इस बात की कसौटी है कि क्या केन्द्र सरकार व्यापारिता से, निष्पक्षता से जनता के निर्णय का भासादर करेगी, क्या केन्द्र सरकार गैर-कांग्रेसी मंत्रि-मंडलों के साथ, जैसा वह घोषणा करती है, सहयोग का आचरण करेगी।

राजस्थान की घटनाएँ इस बात का संकेत देती हैं कि गैर-कांग्रेसी मंत्रि-मंडलों को केन्द्र के कर्त्तव्यपूर्ण व्यवहार के लिए तैयार रहना

चाहिए। कोई कसर नहीं बा कि राजस्थान में गैर-कांग्रेसी सरकार न बनने दी जाती। अब कहा जाता है कि हम ने अनेक अर्थों में गैर-कांग्रेसी सरकार बन जाने दी। अगर एक राजस्थान में नहीं बनी तो क्या हुआ? यह कहना बँसा ही है जैसे कि यह कहना कि हमारे दामन पर एक ही बाग लगा है तो इस से क्या हुआ? बाकी का दामन तो साफ है। क्या माये पर कलंक का एक टीका पर्याप्त नहीं है? क्या एक राजस्थान में लोकतन्त्र की हत्या काफी नहीं है?

सभापति जी, गृह मन्त्री जी ने राजस्थान के राज्यपाल के पक्ष में बहुत सी बातें कही हैं। उन से इस बात की आशा भी की जाती है। लेकिन एक बात बह स्पष्ट नहीं कर सके कि राजस्थान में ऐसा क्यों हुआ कि हर बार राज्यपाल का निर्णय कांग्रेस के हक में और गैर-कांग्रेसी दलों के खिलाफ गया? जब उन्होंने एक मंत्रिमंडल बनाने का फैसला कर लिया तब भी उन्होंने कांग्रेस ही को बुलाया? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि केरल में 19 सदस्यों वाले प्रजा समाजवादी दल को भी मंत्रिमंडल बनाने के लिए बुलाया गया था? उस समय तो सिंगिल लाजेंस्ट पार्टी का सवाल खड़ा नहीं हुआ था। प्रजा सोशलिस्ट पार्टी तीसरे नम्बर की पार्टी थी। लेकिन कांग्रेस के हित में उसे निमन्त्रण देना उस समय शायद उचित समझा गया। इसलिए केरल के गवर्नर ने अलग तरीका अपनाया राजस्थान के गवर्नर अलग तरीका अपना रहे हैं। फिर जब श्री सुब्रह्मण्य ने मंत्रिमंडल बनाने से इनकार कर दिया तब राज्यपाल महोदय ने गैर-कांग्रेसी दलों को मंत्रिमंडल बनाने के लिए क्यों नहीं बुलाया? वह कहते हैं कि हम हिंसा को बढ़ावा देना नहीं चाहते। गृह मन्त्री ने भी कहा है कि जयपुर में जाति हो जाने दीजिए, संविधान अपनी गति से चलने लगेगा। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ जयपुर में पहले जाति हुई या संविधान का उल्लंघन हुआ? हम जोड़े के घाने गाड़ी रखने की नकली न करें। प्रकट

में शांति थी। लेकिन राज्यपाल के गलत निर्णय ने लोगों को असन्तुष्ट किया। आज तो जयपुर में पूरी शांति है। वर्षा 144 तक हटा ली गई है। अब राज्यपाल महोदय किस बड़ी की प्रतीक्षा कर रहे हैं? वह किस पंचांग से परामर्श ले रहे हैं? अब राजस्थान में पूरी शांति स्थापित होने में कौन सी देर रह गई है? लेकिन क्या-केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने सारे दायित्व राज्यपाल को सौंप दिए हैं? क्या राज्यपाल महोदय इसे प्रतिष्ठा का प्रश्न बनाकर बैठे हैं? क्या राज्यपाल महोदय जब तक नहीं चाहेंगे तब तक राजस्थान की जनता को अपना हासन प्राय चलाने के अधिकार से बंचित रखा जायगा? इस मामले में केन्द्र सरकार की भी जिम्मेदारी है।

सभापति जी, राजस्थान के विधायक बड़ी भासाएं लेकर दिल्ली में आए थे। अगर उन्हें यह मामला जयपुर की सड़कों पर तय करना होता तो वह राष्ट्रपति भवन का दरवाजा बटखटाने के लिए न आते। उन्हें भासा भी केन्द्र न्याय करेगा। जब तक देश में यह भासा जीवित है तब तक भारत की एकता और अखंडता के लिए खतरा नहीं है। लेकिन आपने उनकी भासा को ठुकराकर केन्द्र के प्रति भी लोगों के विश्वास की भावना को कम कर दिया है। सारे देश को केन्द्राभिमुख होना चाहिए। कम से कम केन्द्र से न्याय मिलना चाहिए और अगर कहीं अन्याय होता है तो केन्द्र को उस अन्याय का निराकरण करना चाहिए। मन्त्री यह सुनकर बड़ा खेद हुआ जब एक कांग्रेस के मन्त्री ने कहा कि जो विधान सभा के 93 सदस्य प्राये थे वह जोर बर्बंस्ती से लाए गए थे। यह कह कर उन्होंने जनता के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों का ही अपमान नहीं किया हमारे राष्ट्रपति की प्रतिष्ठा को भी खतरे में डाला। सभापति जी, क्या राष्ट्रपति भवन में 93 विधायक पुलिस के पहरे में गए

थे? यह बात गलत है। मेरे पास 93 विधायकों का फोटो है। यह फोटो मेरे घर पर खींचा गया था। वहां पत्रकार मौजूद थे, फोटोग्राफर मौजूद थे। क्या यह फोटो पुलिस के घेरे में खींचा गया था। सभापति जी, मैं इस फोटो को टेबल पर रखने की इजाजत चाहता हूँ।

सभापति जी, हम आशा करते थे, राष्ट्रपति के अधिभाषण में जो कुछ राजस्थान में गलती की गई है उसको सुधारा जायगा। लेकिन वह भी हमारी आशा पूरी नहीं हुई। आज भी हम आशा करते थे कि इस विवाद का उत्तर देते हुए प्रधान मंत्री महोदय या गृह मन्त्री महोदय यह घोषणा करेंगे कि अब जयपुर में स्थिति सामान्य हो गई है इसलिए संविधान की प्रक्रिया को लागू करने का मौका दिया जायगा। महारानी साहिबा के कथन को गलत मत समझिए। श्री खडिलकर ने मेरे कथन को भी कल गलत समझने की गलती की थी। अपने भाषण में मैंने कोई धमकी नहीं दी थी। मैंने केवल एक चेतावनी दी थी। एक मित्रतापूर्ण चेतावनी, जो देश के हित में है और जो लोकतंत्र के हित में है।

आखिर राजस्थान की जनता के श्रेय की भी एक सीमा है। राजस्थान की जनता शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से अपनी लड़ाई जारी रखगी। लोकतंत्र में हिंसा के लिए जगह नहीं हो सकती। हमें हिंसात्मक आन्दोलनों से बचना होगा। लेकिन शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से लड़ाई का हम जनता का अधिकार नहीं छीन सकते, विशेषकर तब जब राजस्थान में खुला अन्याय होता है और केन्द्र द्वारा उस अन्याय पर मोहर लगायी जाती है। अभी समय है, केन्द्र की निष्पक्षता में जनता के विश्वास को बिनसे से रोका जा सकता है। अभी समय है गैर-कांग्रेसी सरकारों के मन में सन्देश की किरण पैदा होने से रोकी जा सकती है। प्रधान मन्त्री की केवल घोषणा ही काफी नहीं है कि वह गैर-कांग्रेसी सरकारों के साथ सहयोग करना चाहती हैं। सहयोग

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

की कसौटी है राजस्थान। अगर राजस्थान में गैर-कांग्रेसी सरकार बनने दी जायगी तो हम समझते हैं कि केन्द्र के इरादे अच्छे हैं। नहीं तो, हमने अपना निर्णय करने के लिए विवश होना पड़ेगा। सभापति महोदय, मैं एक बात कहकर खत्म कर दूंगा। कांग्रेसी सदस्यों की ओर से इस बात पर टीका टिप्पणी की गई है ... (अपवाचन) यह धमकी नहीं है, चेतावनी है। कांग्रेसी सदस्यों की ओर से इस बात पर टीका टिप्पणी की गई है कि कम्युनिस्ट और जनसंघ या और पार्टियों को मिलाकर सरकारें बना रहे हैं। यह भ्रालोचना कम से कम कांग्रेसी सदस्यों के मुह से शोभा नहीं देती। हम अपने मतभेदों के बारे में प्रामाणिक हैं, यहां भ्राला भ्राला पार्टियों में बैठे, अगर कांग्रेस खुद ही एक ऐसी पार्टी है, जिसमें कम्युनिस्ट भी हैं, सोशलिस्ट भी हैं और ...

श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण : जनसंघी भी हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अगर आप यह मानकर चलते हैं कि आपके भीतर जनसंघी भी हैं, तो यह मानना होगा कि कांग्रेस एक पार्टी नहीं है, चों-चों का मुरब्बा है और केवल सत्ता ने कांग्रेस की बांध रखा है।

हम अगर सरकारें बना रहे तो जनता की सेवा करने के लिए सरकारें बना रहे हैं, हम सत्ता हथियाने के लिये सरकारें नहीं बना रहे हैं। हम यूनतम कार्यक्रमों के आधार पर सरकारें बना रहे हैं और जब तक जनता की सेवा कर सकेंगे हम उन सरकारों में रहेंगे, नहीं तो हम सरकारों को छोड़कर बाहर निकल आयेंगे। अगर हमारा स्वरूप कांग्रेस पार्टी जैसा नहीं है। इसीलिये कांग्रेस की पराजय हुई है। कांग्रेस को हवा का रुख पहचानना चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं सदन के यह प्रपील करना चाहता हूँ कि सदन मेरे प्रस्ताव को

स्वीकार करे और इस सरकार को अघटस्थ कर दे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात और। क्या गृह मंत्री महोदय को मालूम है कि राजस्थान के चीफ सैक्रेटरी अभी भी फाइलें लेकर सुबाइयाके पास जाते हैं? क्या इस बात की वह जांच कराने के लिये तैयार हैं, अगर यह बात साबित हो जायगी तो क्या वह अपने चीफ सैक्रेटरी को वापस बुलाने के लिये तैयार हैं?

श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण : जरूर बुलायेंगे।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : राजस्थान में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उसे कोई भी शोभाजनक नहीं मान सकता। राष्ट्रपति राज्य इसीलिये लू किया गया है कि सुबाइया फिर से अपना बहुमत प्राप्त कर लें। हम यह बात कभी होने नहीं देंगे। जब तक यह केन्द्र सरकार रहेगी तब तक इस तरह की घाघलिया होगी, इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि सदन मेरे प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करे और इस शासन को अघटस्थ कर दे।

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers."

16.53 hrs.

The Lok Sabha divided:

I think the voting will take a little time. After the voting is over, we will adjourn for ten minutes and then hear the Finance Minister. I hope I have the permission of the House. Now, slips will be given to you. Please do not get up from your seats. Please take the slip, write your name and constituency and return the slips. The slips will be collected back from you by the staff.

Mr. Speaker: Now the lobbies have been cleared I will put it to the vote. Slips are being distributed to the Members.

श्री मधु लिववे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, कितनी पर्चियां बांटी गई हैं, इस पर नियन्त्रण कैसे रहेगा ?

Mr. Speaker: Every hon. Member will be provided with a slip.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I think it will be better if you ask those who are in support of the motion to stand up, count their number and then ask those who are against it also to stand up.

Mr. Speaker: But in that way we will not have any record as to who voted for and who against. This procedure is better.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): But how do you know how many Members are present so that only that number of slips can be issued? Otherwise, absent members can also be issued slips.

Mr. Speaker: I would request hon. Members to remain in their seats. Let us follow this procedure now. The chits will be collected from them in their seats.

17 hrs.

श्री मधु लिववे : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सभी जो मतदान चल रहा है उसके नतीजे का ऐलान आप सभी बोधित करने जा रहे हैं। मैं मतदान के फीसले का आपके द्वारा ऐलान किये जाने के पहले उसी के सम्बन्ध में व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने जा रहा हूँ... (ब्यबधान) धरे भाई जरा आप शान्त रहने लो अच्छा होगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं श्रीर किन्ही विषय पर नहीं बल्कि इसी मतदान के बारे में आपका ध्यान दिखाने जा रहा हूँ। सम्बन्धित विषय

367 की धोर में आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ... (ब्यबधान) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे सुन रहे हैं आप लोग क्यों ब्यर्थ में परेशान श्रीर प्रश्नान्त हो रहे हैं ?

अब अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो नियम है... (ब्यबधान) मैं जो बोल रहा हूँ क्या यह रेकार्ड हो रहा है ?

सम्बन्धित नियम 367 (1) इस प्रकार है :

"On the conclusion of a debate, the Speaker shall put the question and invite those who are in favour of the motion to say "Aye" and those against the motion to say "No"."

यह तो आपने किया।

367 (2) में यह दिया हुआ है :

"The Speaker shall then say: "I think the Ayes (or the Noes, as the case may be) have it". If the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of a question is not challenged, he shall say twice"...

लेकिन इसकी चुनौती दी गयी है इसलिए इसको नहीं पढ़ता हूँ।

(3) (ए) यह कहता है :

"If the opinion of the Speaker as to the decision of a question is challenged, he shall order that the Lobby be cleared."

यह भी आपने किया है... (ब्यबधान) जरा शान्ति से काम लीजिये। जरा सुनना भी लीजिये। यह परेशान होने श्रीर हल्का मचाने की पुरानी धारत को छोड़िये।

"(बी) After the lapse of two minutes he shall put the question a second time and declare whether in his opinion the "Ayes" or the "Noes" have it."

[श्री ननु लिखते]

यह दल (सी) पर हूँ है।

"If the opinion so declared is again challenged, he shall direct that the votes recorded either by operating the automatic vote recorder."

यह तो आज चल नहीं रहा है।

"or by the members going into the Lobbies:"

Or, by the members going into the Lobbies.

धीर कोई तीसरा तरीका नहीं है। 17 तारीख को भी मैंने बीबी व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने की कोशिश की थी लेकिन यह लोग गड़बड़ बहुत करते हैं... (व्यवधान) इसलिए उस दिन आप चुन नहीं पाये थे लेकिन आप उस दिन की रपट देखिये तो आपको पता चल जायगा। आज फिर दुबारा कानून टूट रहा है। पहले ही मैंने कहा कि कैसे नियमन होगा? मैं इस मतदान को प्रागे नहीं चलने दूँगा जब तक कि प्रोटोमैटिक बोट रेकार्डर नहीं चलता या फिर आप दोनों को कक्षाओं में लाबीज में भेजे। उस दल में आज हरियाणा वालों की तरह कुछ लोग है उनको भी मौका दें हमारे साथ आकर बोट देने का ताकि कल ही गैर-कांग्रेसी हुकमत केन्द्र में भी कायम हो . . .

एक जाननीय सचरख्य: हम हरियाणा वाले आप लोगों को भी इधर ले आयेगे।

श्री ननु लिखते: कोई नहीं आयेगा।

Mr. Speaker: It is only or convenience because we do not have Division numbers. We cannot go into the Lobbies either. It is clear on page 64 of the Handbook for Members under the heading "Division by distribution of slips in the House".....(Inter-ruption).

श्री ननु लिखते: अध्यक्ष महोदय, लकीरियंस वाली सुविधा प्रक्रिया संबंधी तथ्यों के सामने कोई चीज नहीं है।

Shri N. Sreekantam Nair: It is a rule.

Mr. Speaker: It is only an ad hoc arrangement.

Shri N. Sreekantam Nair: We do not want an ad hoc arrangement. In the face of a definite rule, how can you refer to the Handbook?

Shri Tridib Kumar Chandhuri (Berhampore): If you will kindly look to the Preface of the Handbook that you just now read out, it is clearly written that if any direction or any observation in the Handbook is in contradiction with the Rules, the Rules are binding and not the Handbook.

Mr. Speaker: There is no contradiction here. It is only for facilitating it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: In the first Lok Sabha and the second Lok Sabha when there was no automatic voting system. I know how voting was taking place. I was here when the automatic voting system was introduced.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj: Sir, I rise on a point of order. When you have given your ruling, can that be questioned?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is very wrong on the part of Shri Bajaj to interrupt like this. Probably, he did not hear me. My submission is only this. When the automatic voting system was introduced, though we used to divide with the help of the machine, there were instances when this machinery failed. So, we have to follow the correct system which is mentioned in the rules, which is mandatory, unless that particular rule is suspended under rule 388. You cannot ignore that rule. That rule is mandatory and not recommendatory and so it has to be followed. I am not imputing any motive on your ruling, but because of our experience

of bogus voting in the general elections we apprehend bogus voting here also. So I would request you to abide by the convention and not deviate from the rule to give an advantage to the ruling party I would again request you to abide by the rule

एक माननीय सदस्य एक तरफ तो सदन के माननीय सदस्य दस्तखत करते जा रहे हैं परन्तियो पर और दूसरी तरफ

ऐतराज करते हैं। घसल मे उन्हें अपने ऊपर विश्वास नहीं है। .. (अध्यक्षान)

Mr Speaker: It is all right Because the division numbers have not been given

बी मधु लिखते मैं इसको नहीं मानता। आप अध्यक्ष हैं, सब कुछ कर सकते हैं और उसके धाने हम झुकेंगे, लेकिन मेरा मन इस बात को नहीं कबूल कर रहा है। कुछ कांग्रेसी इनके खिलाफ वोट करने वाले हैं इसलिये वह बबरा रहे हैं।

Division No. 2]

AYES

Abraham, Shri K M
 Adichan, Shri P C
 Amat, Shri D
 Amin, Prof R K
 Amin, Shri Ramchandra J
 Amersey, Shri M
 Anbazhagan, Shri
 Anbuchezhian, Shri
 Anirudhan, Shri K
 Banerjee, Shri S M
 Barua, Shri Hem
 Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy
 Basu, Dr Maitreyee
 Behera, Shri Baidhar
 Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
 Bhagaban Das, Shri
 Bharat Singh, Shri (Dhar
 Birla, Shri R K
 Biswas, Shri J M
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
 Brij Bhushan Lal, Shri
 Chakrapani, Shri C K
 Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
 Chatterjee, Shri H R
 Chatterjee, Shri N.C
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
 Chowdhury, Shri B K Das
 Dange, Shri S A
 Deo, Shri K P Singh
 Deo, Shri P K
 Desai, Shri C.C.
 Desai, Shri Dinkar
 Dhandapani, Shri
 Digvijai Nath, Mahant
 Dipa, Shri A
 Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
 Goshose, Shri P P
 Fernandes, Shri George
 Gayatri Devi, Shriamati
 Gool, Shri Shri Chand

Gopalan, Shri A K
 Gopalan, Shri P
 Gopalan, Shriamati Susela
 Gopalar, Shri D S
 Gounder, Shri C Muthusamy
 Gowd, Shri Gedilingana
 Gowda, Shri M H
 Gowder, Shri Nanja
 Guha, Prof Samar
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Gupta, Shri Kanwarlal
 Haider, Shri K
 Jageshwar, Shri
 Jai Bahadur Singh, Shri
 Jamna Lal, Shri
 Janardhanan, Shri C
 Jena, Shri D D
 Jha, Shri Bhogendra
 Joshi, Shri Jagannath Rao
 Kachhavays Shri Hukam Chand
 Kalita, Shri Dhireswar
 Kamalanathan, Shri
 Kameshwar Singh, Shri
 Kandappan, Shri S.
 Kapoor, Shri Lakhan Lal
 Karni Singh, Dr
 Kaushik, Shri K M
 Khan, Shri Ajmal
 Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali
 Khan, Shri Latifat Ali
 Khan, Shri Zulfiqar Ali
 Kiruttinan, Shri
 Kisku, Shri A K
 Kothari, Shri S S
 Krishnamoorthi, Shri V
 Kuchelar, Shri G
 Kundu, Shri S
 Kunte, Shri Dattatraya
 Kushwah, Shri Y S
 Lakkappa, Shri K
 Limaye, Shri Machu

Lobo Prabhu Shri
 Madhok Shri Bal Raj
 Madhukar, Shri K M
 Mahato, Shri Bhajahr
 Masti, Shri S N
 Majhi, Shri M
 Manoharan, Shri
 Masani, Shri M R
 Meetha Lal, Shri
 Meghehendra, Shri M
 Menon, Shri V V
 Misra, Shri Smitas
 Mody, Shri Pilloo
 Mohamed Imem, Shri
 Moharomad Ismail, Shri
 Molahu, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shri H N
 Mulla, Shri A N
 Naik, Shri G C
 Naik, Shri R V
 Nair, Shri N Sreekantn
 Nair, Shri Vasudevan
 Nembiar, Shri
 Narayanan, Shri
 Nayanar, Shri E K
 Nayar, Shri K K
 Nayar, Shriamati Shakuntala
 Nihal, Shri
 Onkar Singh, Shri
 Padanatha, Shri Muhamed S
 Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
 Parmar, Shri D R
 Patel, Shri J H
 Patel, Shri Pashabha
 Patil, Shri N R
 Petodis, Shri D N
 Rai, Shri Charanjeer
 Rajaram, Shri
 Ram Singh, Shri
 Ram Chohan, Shri
 Ramamoorthy Shri P

Kamari, Shri K.
 Ranjeet Singh, Shri
 Raou, Shri Durali
 Ray, Shri Rabi
 Reddy, Shri Bawara
 Samsanta, Shri S.C.
 Sambandan, Shri S.K.
 Sambhal, Shri Ishaq
 Saminathan, Shri
 Satya Narain Singh, Shri
 Sen, Shri Devan
 Shah, Shri T.P.

Agadi, Shri S. A.
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Aga, Shri Ahmad
 Ahmad, Dr. I.
 Ahmad, Shri F.A.
 Anthony, Shri Frank
 Arunangam, Shri R.S.
 Avdesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Asad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Bafai, Shri Kamalnayan
 Bajpai, Shri Shashi Bhushan
 Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
 Barrow, Shri
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata
 Barua, Shri R.
 Barupal, Shri P.L.
 Baswant, Shri
 Beere, Shri S.C.
 Bhagat, Shri B.R.
 Bhagavati, Shri
 Bhakti Darshan, Shri
 Bhandare, Shri R.D.
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Bhargava, Shri B.N.
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.
 Bhole Nath, Shri
 Bist, Shri J.B.S.
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
 Brahm Prakash, Shri
 Buta Singh, Shri
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chatterji, Shri Krishna Kumar
 Chaturvedi, Shri R.L.
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chavan, Shri D.R.
 Chavan, Shri Y.B.
 Choudhury, Shri J.K.
 Choudhury, Shri Valmiki
 Dabir Singh, Shri
 Damani, Shri S.R.
 Das, Shri N.T.
 Das, Shri C.

Saha, Shri Viswendra Kumar J.]
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Sharma, Shri B.S.
 Sharma, Shri N.S.
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar
 Sharma, Shri Yajna Datt
 Sharma, Shri Yogendra
 Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shivappa, Shri N.
 Singh, Shri J.B.
 Sivankaran, Shri
 Solanki, Shri P.N.

Somani, Shri M.K.
 Sreedharan, Shri A.J
 Subravola, Shri
 Suresh Babu, Shri
 Tapaniah, Shri S.K.
 Tyagi, Shri O.P.
 Umasath, Shri
 Vajpayee, Shri A.B.
 Vidyarthi, Shri R.S.
 Viswantharan, Shri P.
 Viswanathan, Shri G.
 Yadav, Shri Ram Sewah
 Yashpal Singh, Shri
 *
 *

NOBS

Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Desai, Shri Morari
 Desmukh, Shri B.D.
 Desmukh, Shri K.G.
 Desmukh, Shri Shivajirao S.
 Dhillon, Shri G.S.
 Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G.C.
 Fring, Shri D.
 Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganesh, Shri K.R.
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Ganpat Sahai, Shri
 Gautam, Shri C.D.
 Gavit, Shri Tukaram
 Ghansara Singh, Shri
 Ghosh, Shri Bimalkanti
 Ghosh, Shri P.K.
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal
 Girja Kumari, Shrimati
 Govind Das, Dr.
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
 Hajarnawia, Shri
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri
 Hari Krishna, Shri
 Hazarika, Shri J.N.
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Himatalingta, Shri
 Hirji, Shri
 Iqbal Singh, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
 Jadhav, Shri V.N.
 Jagjitwan Ram, Shri
 Jamir, Shri S.C.
 Kahandole, Shri
 Kamble, Shri
 Kamla Kumari, Shrimati
 Kasture, Shri A.S.
 Katham, Shri B.N.
 Kavada, Shri B.R.
 Kedaria, Shri C.M.
 Keshri, Shri Sitaram
 Khadilkar, Shri

Khan, Shri M.A. "P"
 Khanna, Shri P.K.
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Kirit, Shri Manikya
 Kotaki, Shri J. Jadhav
 Kirpalani, Shrimati Sucheta
 Krishnan, Shri G.Y.
 Kureel, Shri B.N.
 Kushok Bakula, Shri
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Laskar, Shri N.R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Lutfi Haque, Shri J
 Madho Ram, Shri
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
 Maharaaj Singh, Shri
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
 Malhotra, Shri Inderjit
 Mallariyappa, Shri
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao
 Mansuri Din, Shri
 Mehta, Shri Asoka
 Melkote, Dr.
 Menon, Shri Govinda
 Minimata, Shrimati Agan Das
 Guru
 Mirsa, Shri Babar Ali
 Mishra, Shri Bibbuti
 Mohammad Yusuf, Shri
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati
 Mondal, Shri J.K.
 Mondal, Dr. P.
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
 Mudrika Singh, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharada
 Mukne, Shri Yashwantrao
 Murthi, Shri B.S.
 Murli, Shri M.S.
 Nageshwar, Shri
 Naghooor, Shri M.N.
 Nahata, Shri Amrit
 Naidu, Shri Changanakaya
 Nanda, Shri

Nayn, Dr. Sushila
 Neenawny, Shri
 Oron, Shri Kartik
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
 Palradia, Shri
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Pandit, Shrimati Vijaya Lakshmi
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintaman
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Parmer, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri P.
 Patel, Shri Manibhai J. T.
 Patel, Shri Manubhai
 Patil, Shri N. N.
 Patil, Shri A. V.
 Patil, Shri Deorao
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Patil, Shri S. D.
 Patil, Shri T. A.
 Poonacha, Shri C. M.
 Pradhani, Shri K.
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.
 Prasad, Shri Y. A.
 Qureshi, Shri Shafi
 Radhabai, Shrimati B. K.
 Raghu Ramiah, Shri
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri
 Rajani Gandha, Kumari
 Rajasekhara, Shri
 Raju, Shri D. B.
 Raju, Shri D. S.
 Ram Dhan Das, Shri
 Ram Kishan, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramesh Chandra, Shri
 Rampur Mahadevappa, Shri

Rameshkrishna Prasad Singh, Shri
 Ram, Shri M. B.
 Randhir Singh, Shri J.
 Rane, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Dr. K. L.
 Rao, Shri K. Narayana
 Rao, Shri Muthyal
 Rao, Shri J. Rampathi
 Rao, Shri Thirumala
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.
 Reut, Shri Bhoja
 Reddi, Shri G. S.
 Reddy, Shri Ganga
 Reddy, Shri M. N.
 Reddy, Shri R. D.
 Reddy, Shri Surender
 Robatgi, Shrimati Sushila
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Sadhu Ram, Shri
 Saha, Shri S. K.
 Saigal, Shri A. S.
 Saleem, Shri M. Y.
 Salve, Shri N. K.
 Sanghi, Shri N. K.
 Sanji Rupji, Shri
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sant Bux Singh, Shri
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sayyad Ali, Shri
 Sen, Shri A. K.
 Sen, Shri Dwajpayan
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Sethurama, Shri N.
 Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
 Shah, Shri Manabendra
 Shah, Shri Shantilal
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Shankaranand, Shri
 Shashi Ranjan, Shri

Shastri Shri B. N.
 Shastri, Shri Ramanand
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Sher Singh, Prof.
 Sheth, Shri T. M.
 Shinde, Shri Anasahib
 Shiv Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Shukla, Shri S. N.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddaaya, Shri
 Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
 Singh, Shri D. N.
 Singh, Shri D. V.
 Sinha, Shri R. K.
 Sinha, Shri Sarya Narayan
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarakeswari
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Solanki, Shri S. M.
 Sonar, Shri A. G.
 Sunderasam, Shri M.
 Sunder Lal, Shri
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
 Suryanarayana, Shri K.
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Tamaskar, Shri
 Tarodekar, Shri V. B.
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Tripathi, Shri K. D.
 Tula Ram, Shri
 Tulidas, Shri
 Ujkey, Shri M. G.
 Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
 Veerappa, Shri Ramachandra
 Venkatasubbsiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shri Balgovind
 Verma, Shri P. C.
 Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti
 Yadav, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet, Shri

Mr. Speaker: It is all right. Now I would request all the hon. Members to sit down. The result of the division is: Ayes 162; Noes 257. So, 'Noes' have it.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: We shall now adjourn the House for ten minutes and meet again when the Finance Minister will present the budget.

17.10 hrs.

(The Lok Sabha then adjourned for ten minutes).

The Lok Sabha reassembled at Twenty Minutes Past Seventeen of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

GENERAL BUDGET, 1967-68

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Finance Minister.

Some hon. Members: The Finance Minister is not present here.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): The Finance Minister is missing....

An hon. Member: He is just coming into the House.

Shri Nambiar: He cannot be late like this. We are very sorry that he is late by two minutes. Two minutes can mean several crores of rupees to the nation. He should have been here in time.

Mr. Speaker: Let Shri Nambiar resume his seat now.

The hon. Finance Minister.