

Penal Code read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, and further investigations are proceeding.

---

12. 22 hrs

### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, if you look at the Order Paper for today you will find that item No. 10 relates to a motion which says :

“That the statement made by the Minister of Home Affairs on the 6th March, 1969 regarding the Address by the Governor of West Bengal to both Houses of the State Legislature assembled together on the 6th March, 1969, be taken into consideration.”

I understand that on Thursday last a substantive motion was given by my hon. friend Shri Madhu Limaye which sought to disapprove the conduct of the Governor in skipping over things from the Address. Under rule 186 that substantive motion, I believe, is quite in order because it satisfies all the conditions in order that a motion may be admissible laid down under that Rule. There is not even one condition that substantive motion does not fulfil. And, in point of time I understand that was the first motion that was given. Probably, due to inadvertence it might have escaped the notice of your office. If that be the case I believe that the discussion should take place on such a substantive motion rather than on the statement made by the Home Minister which is nothing because the Home Minister only said that he is collecting the information. What is the discussion that can take place on a statement that he is collecting the information? Let him collect the information and place it before the House. We have to wait till he has collected the information. Therefore, I think some mistake has been committed. I did not want to raise this point at 4.00 P. M. today when we take up this subject because if that mistake has been committed that may be corrected and a discussion started on a substantive motion. If Shri Vajpayee wants to move that motion I think Shri Madhu Limaye will have no objection whatsoever. It is only a question of having this discussion on a substantive motion.

**MR. SPEAKER :** Anybody can move an amendment to this motion also. Shri Madhu Limaye's motion was made much earlier. A number of motions came in on so many things. Therefore, I requested Shri Limaye to consult all leaders of the Opposition and give a common motion. There must be some information before the House for hon. Members to discuss. Then we got the information that some paragraphs were not read. It is very difficult for the Speaker to fix up a time and say which is the first motion that has been received. I do not blame the office for what has been put down. I take the whole responsibility. I gave instructions to them one hour before Parliament met. The statement made by the Home Minister on the floor of the House is the authoritative information for this House. Now we are considering the legality of it—whether the Governor can skip over passages, whether it is right or wrong. We are considering only that point. On this question the correct official information that this House had was the statement of the Home Minister. Therefore, I put that deadline. Further, this resolution does not prohibit any hon. Member from moving an amendment, disapproving the motion or approving it. The House has a right to do it. But since the motion has been admitted, there is no question of changing it.

As is the practice in this House, I would request every party to give the names of their representatives who will participate in this discussion. Though there are many names in this list, it does not mean that everybody from that list will be called. We are not following that practice. Each party can give one name. Also, any member can give notice of an amendment up to 2 o'Clock or 3 o'Clock, approving, disapproving or condemning anything. But now this motion has been accepted and admitted, to say that it should be changed is wrong. All the parties may give the names of their representatives who will speak on this motion. We will take it up at 4 P. M.

**श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने जो निर्णय केंस है, वह तो आप दे ही सकते हैं। लेकिन उससे पहले महरबानी करके दो मिनिट के लिए मेरी बात सुन लीजिये।

**MR. SPEAKER :** I have given my *Nirnay*.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप ने मेरी बात नहीं सुनी। आपने कहा है कि अन्य दलों के साथ बात कीजिए। मैं साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि कौन माननीय सदस्य प्रस्ताव पेश करे, इस बारे में मेरा कोई झगड़ा नहीं है। अगर माननीय सदस्य, श्री हिरेन मुकर्जी या श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी, उस प्रस्ताव को पेश करना चाहते हैं, तो उससे मेरा कोई झगड़ा नहीं है। मेरा सबाल सिर्फ यह है कि मेरा जो प्रस्ताव है, उसको आप मान लीजिये। उसको चाहे श्री वाजपेयी पेश करें।

MR. SPEAKER : As I have already said, I have given my decision. Now if you want to make a speech, I have no objection. But I have given my ruling already.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : What is there to argue about your ruling? Is it not final?

MR. SPEAKER : But that is what is happening now.

श्री मधु लिमये : श्री रंगा के बीच में दखल देने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। मेरा ब्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिये।

SHRI RANGA : I may inform Shri Limaye that I am dealing with the chair and not with him. The chair has given its ruling. Now, how could objection be taken to that? (Interruptions)

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ब्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा रहा हूँ।

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य, श्री मधु लिमये, पायंट आफ आर्डर उठा रहे हैं। क्या उन्हें पायंट आफ आर्डर उठाने का अधिकार नहीं है?

MR. SPEAKER : I would not allow all this. What rule I have violated? There cannot be any point of order on the ruling of the Speaker. How can there be a point of order on that?

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपके रूलिंग पर कौन पायंट आफ आर्डर उठा रहा है?

MR. SPEAKER : Now what is the point of order?

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मेरी बात तो सुनिये न।

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : क्यों सुनें ?

श्री मधु लिमये : माननीय सदस्य तो अध्यक्ष नहीं हैं।

SHRI SHEO NARIAN : Sir, I would request you to put an end to all this. Every day after lunch hour, at 2 O'Clock some point or other is raised, saying the Speaker has said this or that.

MR. SPEAKER : That is why I am finishing it now. Now this motion had been admitted. This discussion is closed; there will be no more discussion about it. If Shri Madhu Limaye wants to argue on any other point, he may do so. On this point, he has sought my permission to raise it and I have allowed him to raise it. He was kind enough to inform me also that he was raising it. A decision has been taken on that point and that issue is closed. If he wanted to raise any other point, if he had written to me, I would have allowed him. I have no objection to it. But now there can be no discussion on this point.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपको याद होगा कि आपने कहा था कि अगर सर्व-सम्मति से कोई प्रस्ताव आयेगा, तो आप उस पर विचार करेंगे।

MR. SPEAKER : I myself announced it that if all the parties want to move it, they can do so.

श्री मधु लिमये : उसके बाद मैंने अन्य दलों के नेताओं के साथ बातचीत की। मैं फिर इस बात को साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ कि मेरा यह आग्रह नहीं है कि चूँकि मेरा प्रस्ताव पहले था, इसलिए मुझे ही वह प्रस्ताव पेश करने की

हजाजत दी जाये। पिछली बार अविश्वास प्रस्ताव को पेश करने का अधिकार मेरे द्वारा श्री राममूर्ति को दिया गया था। मैं इस प्रस्ताव को पेश करने का अधिकार श्री वाजपेयी या श्री हिरेन मुकर्जी को देने के लिए तैयार हूँ। जब बंगाल से इस बारे में पी० टी० आई की पहली खबर आई और हमारे नोटिस बोर्ड पर लगी—उसके बारे में कोई विवाद नहीं हो सकता है—तो उसके बाद बिल्कुल नियम और कानून के अनुसार मैंने यह सबस्टेिटिव मोशन दिया। इस प्रस्ताव को चाहे श्री वाजपेयी मूव करें और चाहे श्री सुरेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी मूव करें। मैं कभी अपने लिए नहीं लड़ता हूँ। मैं सिद्धांतों की बात कर रहा हूँ। मेरा प्रस्ताव इस प्रकार है :

“That this House disapproves the action of the West Bengal Governor in not acting strictly as a constitutional head inasmuch as he has refused to read the text of the mandatory address, as drafted by the Cabinet of West Bengal, and provoked ugly scenes in the Legislature and raised a needless constitutional controversy with frightful implications to the already strained Centre-State relations and the future of democracy in this country”.

इस प्रस्ताव पर द्रविड़ मुनेत्र कडगम, सी० पी० आई० (माकिस्ट), सी० पी० आई०, बंगला काँग्रेस की ओर से श्री सामन्त के और श्री बदरुद्दुजा के, इन सब सदस्यों के दस्तखत हैं। ऐसी हालत में चाहे श्री वाजपेयी मेरे इस प्रस्ताव को ले लें और चाहे श्री सुरेन्द्र नाथ द्विवेदी ले लें, मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है। लेकिन सबस्टेिटिव प्रस्ताव आये। इसलिए आप इस बारे में सोच समझकर दोपहर दो बजे के बाद निर्णय दीजिये।

MR. SPEAKER : The *nirnay* has already been given. I am not going to change it.

श्री मधु सिमये : यह बिल्कुल गलत है। यह स्वेच्छाचारिता, आर्बिट्रेरी है। यह नियम के खिलाफ है।

MR. SPEAKER : I have given my ruling,

whether you like it or not. It is there. There will not be any change.

12 31 hrs.

#### GENERAL BUDGET—GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd

MR. SPEAKER : We now take up the General Budget. We have already taken 4 hours and 50 minutes. Another 15 hours and 10 minutes remain. Shri Manoharan.

SHRI MANOHARAN (Madras North) : Mr. Speaker, Sir at the outset let me offer my birthday greetings to the author of the present Budget, Mr. Morarji Desai. He is now 73. He stands between the two mighty orders, the order that is dead and the order that is emerging. He might have seen in life much and gained rich in experience, not only political but social, economic and what not of the country. I can console myself by thinking that our Finance Minister can be a better guide, though not a good master, of the affairs of the country. Mr. Morarji Desai knows better than anybody else regarding the affairs of the nation. He knows where the wind is blowing ; he knows where the shoe pinches. So, I want to make some observations for the consideration of our Finance Minister.

After 1967 General Elections, the country has got the unique opportunity of passing through a certain mental and intellectual revolution. The people in the country are now trying to write the history of their own. The monolithic order, the Congress Party, enjoyed in the past 20 years has been smashed to smithereens and the myth that the Congress Party alone could deliver the goods has been exploded. All over the country, a sense of responsibility is aroused and a sense of participation is registered.

12.33 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER—in the Chair]

It is true that the fathers of the Constitution had thought that till eternity one and the only party, the Congress Party, will rule the country and they would not have visualised a sort of contingency that the Congress Party may go to the walls and the opposition may take up the administration of the