

MR. SPEAKER : Now only two groups are left—D.M. with 18 minutes and Unattached 17 minutes.

SHRIMATI ILA PAL CHOUDHURI (KRISHNAGAR) : Lady members should have a chance.

MR. SPEAKER : No separate time is allotted for ladies. All are hon. Members. There are three Independents—Shri Kushwah, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri and Shri Daichowdhury—they can take five minutes each. D.M.K. can have two members. There will be half a dozen members from the Congress side. In all, a dozen names can be completed by 4.30 p.m. We will now adjourn for lunch.

13.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen hours of the Clock.

— — —

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at five minutes past Fourteen of the clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

PERSONAL EXPLANATION BY
MEMBER—*contd.*

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी एक प्रार्थना है...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is unfair ; you take the Chair by surprise.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं बिलकुल नियम और कानून के अनुसार खड़ा हुआ हूँ इस लिए मेरी बात सुन लीजिये ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You ought to have given some notice.

श्री मधु लिमये : नोटिस दिया है ऐसे में थोड़े ही करता हूँ ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The Speaker was here till 1 O'clock.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय से मेरी बात हुई थी । उन्होंने कहा कि अभी मत उठाइये दो बजे तक मैं पढ़ लूंगा ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have not seen anything.

श्री मधु लिमये : अगर मुझे कोई टोके नहीं तो मैं 6 मिनट से अधिक नहीं लूंगा ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Be very brief.

श्री मधु लिमये : 6 मिनट से और क्या कम हो सकता है ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप को याद होगा कि परसों जब ध्यान आकर्षण का यहां पर नोटिस आया था और उस के बारे में जब मैं सवाल करने खड़ा हो गया तो मैं ने संविधान की कुछ धाराओ से उद्धरण देना चाहा, विशेष कर जब मैंने 163 के बारे में उद्धरण देना शुरू किया था तो स्पीकर साहब ने मुझे टोकते हुए कहा कि माननीय सदस्य सदस का समय क्यों बर्बाद कर रहे हैं । इस के बारे में दो राय नहीं हैं । लेकिन उस समय मैं उस में से जो हिस्सा आप के सामने रखना चाहता था उस को लेकर आज एक विवाद खड़ा हो गया है । मैं यह कह रहा था :

“There shall be a Council of Ministers with the Chief Minister at the head to aid and advise the Governor in the exercise of his functions, except in so far as he is by or under this Constitution required to exercise his functions or any of them in his discretion.”

डिस्ट्रिक्शन के बारे में मैं सवाल उठा रहा था । मैं चार पांच बातों को लेकर सरकार से सफाई चाहता था । जिन शब्दों में मैं ने नोटिस दिया था वही शब्द मैं पढ़ता हूँ ताकि लोक सभा का समय बर्बाद न हो । मैं पांच बातें रखना चाहता था और उन पर मैं

स्पष्टीकरण चाहता था :

(1) Whether the Government agree that the Address by the Governor after a General Election is mandatory ;

(2) Whether they agree that the Address must state the causes for the summoning of the new Assembly ;

(3) Whether they agree that the Address is a statement of Government policies and is drafted by the Council of Ministers ;

(4) Whether, as constitutional head, the Governor is not bound to deliver the speech without any change or amendment or omission ; and

(5) Whether the Government agree that the Governor has no discretionary power to change the speech or refuse to deliver it.

स्पीकर साहब ने कहा कि सब लोग इस के बारे में मुत्तफिक राय हैं। स्पीकर साहब और हम लोगों में कोई मतभेद नहीं है। मैं सभी अखबारों के उधारण इस समय नहीं देता हूँ लेकिन चार प्रमुख अखबारों में क्या चीजें आई हैं उनके बारे में ज़रा हम सोचें।

सब से पहले इन्डियन एक्सप्रेस में क्या आया है देखें :

"In this connection, it is pointed out that under article 163 (2) of the Constitution, the Governor has already discretionary powers not to read the text with which he does not agree."

पेट्रियट लिखता है :

"The Committee was aware of the West Bengal Government's intention to draft the Governor's Address in such a manner that it will become an indictment to the Centre's policies and the Governor's action in the State. Some members felt that the Governor was not bound to read the Address prepared by the Government and, in any case, there was no constitutional bar on his leaving out from the draft portions which he might think were derogatory to him for which he did not agree."

अब स्टेट्समैन का मैं पढ़ता हूँ :

"The Statesman's Special Correspondent too has reported that the Government have asked the constitutional experts to study whether it is necessary for the Governor to read his Address in its entirety as prepared by the State Cabinet."

"हिन्दुस्तान स्टैंडर्ड" में भी इसी प्रकार आया है। वह बहुत लम्बा है, इस लिये आप की इजाजत से ऐसा माना जाये कि मैं ने उस को पढ़ा है। रेकार्ड में यह आना चाहिये।

मैं सिर्फ इंटरनल अफेयर्स कमेटी की बैठक की रिपोर्ट के बारे में स्पष्टीकरण चाहता था। संविधान के ऊपर भाष्य करने के नाम पर आज संसदीय प्रणाली और लोकतंत्र की आत्मा को खत्म करने का प्रयास हो रहा है। पश्चिम बंगाल की जनता ने जो अपनी राय व्यक्त की है जो बंडित बिया है; उस को खत्म करने का अगर प्रयास होगा तो, मैं आज गम्भीर चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि नतीजे खराब होंगे। मैं आज इसको बर्षों उठा रहा हूँ, कल भी उठा सकता था, लेकिन कल तक तो सब कुछ हो जायेगा और संवैधानिक संकट उत्पन्न हो जायेगा, केन्द्र और राज्य के बीच में संघर्ष और टकराव हो जायेगा। उस के बाद मेरे सवाल उठाने का कोई मतलब नहीं है। मेरे मन में यह बात है, मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे संविधान पर सब लोग अमल करें। केन्द्र और राज्य के बीच में समझौते के आधार पर रिश्ते कायम हों जनता के निर्णय के सामने हर एक व्यक्ति, हर एक मन्त्री सत्ताधागी दल को और विरोधी दलों को, सब को, झुकना चाहिए।

इस लिए मैं यह बातें आप के सामने रख रहा हूँ। इन चीजों की सफाई होनी चाहिये। स्पीकर साहब के फँसले के बारे में कोई मतभेद नहीं है, लेकिन उनकी बात से

[श्री मधु लिमये]

एसा आभास उत्पन्न हो गया कि सरकार भी मानती है कि जो गवर्नर का अभिभाषण होता है वह मंत्रीमंडल के द्वारा तैयार किया जाता है, उस को पढ़ना अनिवार्य है और बिना तब्दीली किये, परिवर्तन किये गवर्नर उसे पढ़ेगा। जब अपनी रूलिंग देते समय स्पीकर साहब ने मुझे टोका, उस से ऐसा आभास इस सदन में और बाहर पैदा होता है। अगर यह सही होता तो मुझे खुशी होती और मैं समय बरबाद नहीं करता। लेकिन पार्लियामेंटी अफेअर्स मिनिस्टर बैठे हैं, डा० राम सुभग सिंह, अकेले कैबिनेट मिनिस्टर यहां बैठे हैं (व्यवधान) ... मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। डाक्टर साहब, पुराने संसदीय कार्य मंत्री हैं, काबीना के मंत्री हैं। क्या वह इन चीजों के बारे में सफाई देंगे या दिलवायेंगे? पश्चिम बंगाल की जनता के मन में और हम सभी लोगों के मन में जो एक सन्देह उत्पन्न हो गया है कि अब देश का भविष्य क्या है, लोकतंत्र कहां जा रहा है, इस के बारे में हमारा समाधान किया जाये।

श्री मु० अ० खाँ (कामगंज) : उन्होंने महोदय का हवाला दिया है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He gave notice under rule 357...

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I have also given notice under rule 357 ; you can see that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not know what is the reaction of the Speaker...

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : I only want to clarify certain points...

श्री मधु लिमये : हम संविधान को बनाया चाहते हैं। पांच मिनट में क्या होने वाला है ?

श्री मु अ खाँ : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहुत इन्फॉर्टेड वान हो गई है। उन्होंने कहा

है कि स्पीकर ने ऐसी रूलिंग दी है। आप इस का क्लैरिफिकेशन दिलवायें :

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let this be concluded. Rule 357 is the rule for personal explanation. You got some permission or some sort of a permission from the Speaker...

श्री मधु लिमये : आप ने मौका दिया, मैं ने कहा।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You said that you had spoken to the Speaker about it.

श्री मधु लिमये : हां यह सही है। मैं ने उन से बात की थी।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have received your notice just now. There is no question of debate on this issue. Regarding certain observations made by the Speaker, to which you referred, I will have to see the record ; I have not seen that.

श्री मधु लिमये : अभी मंगवाइये। अध्यक्ष महोदय ने जो बात कही मैं उस की आलोचना नहीं कर रहा हूँ। गलतफहमी किसी के मन में न हो। मैं सिर्फ इतना कहना चाहता था...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will have to see the observations made by the Speaker.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय समझते थे कि यह मानी हुई बातें हैं। इस के बारे में कोई भगड़ा नहीं है। लेकिन भगड़ा कैबिनेट की इन्टर्नल अफेअर्स कमेटी ने उठाया है।

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (BOMBAY CENTRAL) : I admire your patience...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : From both sides I am being harassed.

The point is that, under this rule, no debate is permissible. Only a personal explanation has to be made.

श्री सु० अ० झाँ : यह डिबेट का सवाल नहीं है, यह स्पीकर के आब्जेंशन्स का सवाल है। इस को क्लिअर होना चाहिये।

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : I have already given notice under rule 377. And I have already risen on a point of order...

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Roh-Tak : On a point of order. Is the Chair hard of hearing ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall listen to him.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I am rising on a constitutional point...

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : I have already given notice under rule 377.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : So far as Shri Madhu Limaye's notice is concerned, as I said, I was taken by surprise, because I did not know anything about what had happened, whether he had given notice...

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I did not take the Lok Sabha Secretariat by Surprise.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He had mentioned that he had acquainted the Speaker and submitted that under rule 357 he wanted to give a personal explanation.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I had given notice.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Whether permission was given by the Speaker, I do not know...

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I mentioned it and he has not refused permission

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is true. It is a negative thing.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I have already made the explanation. The whole matter is over, as far, as I am concerned.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Under the rules, specific permission is called for. Keeping silent is no permission. That is not a correct implication,

What I would suggest is this. The hon. Member has raised certain issues on a point of personal explanation. The hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is here and I presume he will carry all the points to the Minister concerned. That is all.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGAU-RAMAI AH) : I do not know what happened between the Chair and Shri Madhu Limaye. Now, the point is that the hon. Member has made some personal explanation under rule 357 and he has said something. Where is the question of Government's reaction to it? (Interruption) Will you please read the rule? The rule reads thus :

"A member may, with the permission of the Speaker, make a personal explanation although there is no question before the House, but in this case no debatable matter may be brought forward, and no debate shall arise."

So, where is the question of our saying something and of our reacting to something? That is outside the scope of this rule.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When he gave his personal explanation, he drew the attention of Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to it. At the end he suggested that this matter required the immediate attention of Government. The usual practice is that if any matter is raised on the floor of the House, even by surprise and certain immediate attention is called for, the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs tries to convey it to the Minister concerned. There is no question of debate now. There is no debate now...

SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH : The point is that either I am bound to react or not. Under this rule, I am not bound to react.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is supposed to convey it to the Minister concerned.

SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH : That is not within the scope of this rule.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I would plead with him. It is not a question of reaction. He is supposed to report to the Minister concerned the points that were raised.

SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH : Would the Chair please listen to us also? (*Interruptions*) Any hon. Member may at any time, without any proper provision for it on the Order Paper, may raise any question and ask Government to rush and bring the Minister here and give the reply...

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I had given notice.

SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH : There must be some procedure about it.

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : I had raised a point of order...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let the hon. Member resume his seat.

The point that the hon. Minister has raised is normally conceded, and whatever submission is made by the Member is brushed aside and no debate ensues on it. But on certain occasions, when a certain emergency arises and a certain question is raised in this House, the hon. Minister is not supposed to react in the sense that he should give a reply here and now, but he is supposed to convey the information to the Minister concerned.

That is the only thing expected of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. It is for him to decide. That is all.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH :
On a point of Order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What is Shri Bhandare's point of order?

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : I stood up first.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I cannot give preference to him,

SHRI J.M. BISWAS (Banthaura) : The Minister must apologise to the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No apology is called for.

SHRI R.D. BHANDRE : As regards my point of order, the first point is that whatever opinion might have been given by the Speaker...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not know that.

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : I am dealing with the aspect on which the hon. Member gave an explanation he gave a personal explanation based on an observation made by the Speaker. Whatever observation has been made by the Speaker, no member has any right to raise the question explaining as to whether that observation was right or wrong.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : I have not criticised the Speaker.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : It is a question of reflection.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : No, no. It is nonsense. I cast no reflection on the Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shall I read out to him the notice? It is clear. There is nothing in the notice casting any aspersion.

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : I am quite familiar with the rule which deals with personal explanation. His personal explanation is based on the observation of the Speaker.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : He is questioning your ruling.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will read out the notice. He has said that the other day while he was speaking, he was interrupted by the Speaker and could not complete what he wanted to say. Here is the text of his notice :

"In the course of the question on Shri Dharma Vira in the calling attention notice, I was seeking clarification on the

following points when you repeatedly interrupted me saying 'All this is accepted. Nobody is disputing it' and that I need not waste the time of the House."

His personal explanation is made to that interruption.

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : Therefore, the conclusion is that he should not read in the constitutional provisions anything that would tantamount to wasting the time of the House. That was the observation of the Speaker.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : These people are challenging the constitutional provisions.

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : Therefore, where is the need for a personal explanation ? That is the first thing.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : He is not the Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER : Do not get angry,

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : I am used to arguing in courts ; so there is no question of my getting angry.

Whatever the Governor may do tomorrow, whether he will expunge certain portions from the address prepared by the Government established by the will of the people, if he does so, there is a remedy open to them.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : He should fall sick.

SHRI R.D. BHANADRE : If his conduct is within the constitutional precincts, they cannot do anything; if it is not, certainly they may take whatever action open to them. But the hon. Member cannot forestal it and foresee a thing and raise the question in the House under the garb of a personal explanation.

Therefore, you should have ruled it out. Even now you can rule out the personal explanation and not ask the Government either to pay attention to it or do anything about it. Whatever

the Governor will do, he will do as his duty under the provisions of the Constitution.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I would like to point out that so far as the personal explanation is concerned, he was interrupted, and he thought that if he had been given an opportunity to conclude...

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : You are challenging the authority of the Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have not understood what he has written here. It is not a question of challenging the authority of the Speaker. I have read out what he has said. He is not challenging the authority of the Speaker. Certain observations after interrupting him were made. The Speaker has not given a ruling at all. You have absolutely misunderstood. I have not asked the Government to offer an explanation, to give anything just now. The only thing is that the last observation was that this matter was likely to be raised tomorrow and the time at our disposal is short. Beyond that there is nothing,

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : If it is raised, it will be dealt with according to constitutional provisions.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will give you permission, but he rose first.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : I am raising this point of order under rule 376 (2), which reads :

"A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There is no business before the House. The business before the House is the Railway Budget.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am coming to that. The business before the House is the Railway Budget, and we want under rule 340 that the debate be adjourned. I am coming to that. I am absolutely relevant, and that is

[Shri S- M. Banerjee]

why they are shouting. My point is this, that Mr. Limaye has raised...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has given a personal explanation. I have not permitted him to raise anything.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Unfortunately, when the Speaker said something, it was open to Mr. Limaye to offer a personal explanation which is permitted under the rules. Fortunately for us and unfortunately for them, this personal explanation has...

(इंटरप्रांज) में हिन्दी में बोल देता हूँ। श्री लिमये ने एक परसनल एक्सप्लेनेशन दिया है। उससे कुछ ऐसी चीजें हमारे सामने आई हैं जो बहुत अहमियत रखती हैं, महत्वपूर्ण हैं। मैं क्यों चाहता हूँ कि रेलवे बजट पर जो डिबेट हो रही है, उसको एडजर्न किया जाए। डा० राम सुभग सिंह जी का भाषण हम सुनने वाले हैं और उसको सुनने के लिए हम आतुर भी हैं। लेकिन फिर भी उसको सुनना नहीं चाहते हैं और चाहते हैं कि यह डिबेट एडजर्न हो, तो आखिर क्यों ?

श्री लिमये ने पांच सवाल उठाये हैं। ये सवाल उन्होंने इसलिए उठाये हैं कि.....

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : It will be dealt with according to the Constitution.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am not discussing the Constitution at all. I am not a constitutional pundit like Mr. Bhandare. Today he has behaved in a fashion that he should be removed from the Panel of Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is not fair.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : I object to the reflection made by Mr. Banerjee.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I object to his reflection made on you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has not made any reflection.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Then, I withdraw.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please be brief.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Let me speak.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Rule 340 is very clear.

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : कल वेस्ट बंगाल एसेम्बली का अधिवेशन होने वाला है, जिस में गवर्नर साहब ने भाषण देना है। यह बात मालूम हो चुकी है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा की वेस्ट बंगाल के चीफ मिनिस्टर और डिप्टी चीफ मिनिस्टर से मुतवातिर बातें हो रही हैं। यह साफ़ कहा गया है :

"No indication was available to what extent the differences between the Centre and the State Government had been resolved over the U.F. demand about the recall of Dharma Vira by Thursday."

Thursday is tomorrow.

अगर इस मामले पर बहस आज ही न कर के इस को कल के लिए उठा रखा जायेगा, तो मुझे खतरा है कि स्टेट और सेंटर के रिलेशन्स शुरू से ही खराब हो जायेंगे। अगर सेंटर के प्रधान मंत्री, उप-प्रधान मंत्री और गृह मंत्री चाहते हैं कि इस बारे में अभी से संघर्ष शुरू हो जाये, तो कोई बात नहीं है, उस के लिए लोग तैयार हैं। लेकिन मैं आप के माध्यम से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि श्री मधु लिमये ने परसनल एक्सप्लेनेशन में जो पार्यट उठाये हैं, उनका जवाब देने के लिए, दूर कल वेस्ट बंगाल में जो संकट उत्पन्न होने वाला है, उस को टालने के लिए, गृह मंत्री जी सदन में आये और स्पष्टीकरण करें, वना संघर्ष होगा और अगर श्री घर्मवीर को वहां पर रखने पर जोर दिया गया तो वेस्ट बंगाल के लोग उन्हें निकाल कर रहेंगे।

श्री एस० एम० जोशी (पूना) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस मोशन का समर्थन करता हूँ। (व्यवधान) यह कोई मजाक की बात नहीं है हम सचमुच इस बात से चिन्तित हैं कि पश्चिमी बंगाल में कल जिन घटनाओं के होने का इमकान है, उन के नतीजे हमारे देश के लिए बहुत खराब होंगे। जब सरकार बार-बार विरोधी दल का सहयोग मांगती है, तो यह बहुत जरूरी है कि सरकार की तरफ से विरोधी दल के साथ बैठ कर इस बारे में कुछ हल निकालने की कोशिश की जाये, वरना आगे चल कर बहुत बड़ा संकट पैदा हो जायेगा, जिस को हमें रोकना चाहिए।

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: My point of order is this. This House has no *locus standi* to go into this matter it is entirely a matter for the State... (Interruptions.) Mr. Madhu Limaye had raised an irrelevant matter and it is unfortunate that about thirty minutes of this House had been taken up in discussing a matter which is totally irrelevant. The Governor has to address a joint session of the legislature after the elections and he is going to do it. Under article 163 he has some discretion. If the United Front Government puts up an address before him saying: you are going to be hanged and you please read it,—then certainly he is not going to do it. Certain discretionary power is given to the Governor and it cannot be challenged anywhere in any forum, not even in this forum which is a sovereign forum. He cannot be dictated by the Council of Ministers about what he should or should not read. This matter cannot be raised here. And this is putting the cart before the horse. The matter is premature. If any irregularity is done there, it could be raised after the address is made. Why is this being done when no address is there, when the Assembly has not been addressed? If some constitutional impropriety is committed, if some irregularities are made, or if the Constitution is flouted, that could be dealt with after the act is committed. Now, before any act has been committed, or before

any wrong is done, they are raising it permanently. Therefore, my point of order is this; there is absolutely no strength in his contention and this matter should not be allowed to be discussed here.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I entirely agree. (Interruption)

श्री मधु लिमये : क्यों ? माननीय सदस्य ने खुद डिसक्रिशन के बारे में चर्चा की है।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : हम लोग इस बारे में डीवेट करने के लिए तैयार हैं। क्या ये लोग तैयार हैं ? गवर्नर को कैबिनेट की बात माननी पड़ेगी, वरना उसे निकाल दिया जायेगा।

SHRI J. M. BISWAS: We want a debate on this particular issue. Dharam Vira cannot be kept in West Bengal against the desire of the people there. Neither Shri Randhir Singh nor the members of the Congress party can keep the Governor there; the people of West Bengal do not want Dharma Vira.

श्री प० ला० बाबूपाल (गंगानगर) : वह नहीं हटेगा, नहीं हटेगा।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Dharam Vira has gone with the wind.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. Shri Narayana Rao.

SARI J. M. BISWAS: Let Randhir Singh go to West Bengal. (Interruption)

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobbili): Sir, the other day, Shri Madhu Limaye quoted the provisions of the Constitution to show that the Governor has to act, and whatever it might be, endeavoured to read out the Constitution in this regard, and the hon. Speaker said, "These are matters which everybody knows." There ends the matter. I was there, and Shri Madhu Limaye was also there. Now, he wanted to give a personal explanation. About what? Is it an explanation of what Mr. Speaker has said?

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: No.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : The very word "personal explanation" indicates that there is something personal about certain things which either he must have misunderstood or has omitted to mention or something like that. Therefore, my submission is that his point of order is out of order, and he ought not to be permitted. Now, having permitted this, I come to the second point. You are a constitutional lawyer and you know the constitutional niceties; you know what the position of the Governor is in the State and what the position of the President is in the set-up of the Union and its relations with the States. There are umpteen marginal areas where the discretion is available for the Governor.

In this context, let us see what the hon. Member has said. After all, the Governor is an institutional head; he is a constitutional figure. Tomorrow, when it comes up,—and the conventions are there—he is entitled to delete those things which may relate to personal things.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : He need not read the address. Read the Constitution please. (*Interruption*)

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : If the State Government,.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have followed your point.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : Suppose, if a State Government brings in a message mentioning certain personal things about the Governor, the Governor is entitled to delete those things.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I had followed your point. Do not amplify.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : We are anticipating something, as to how the Governor is going to face it. (*Interruption*.)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Do not raise a controversy.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO : Now as this question has been permitted to be raised, the point is, whether it is proper

on the part of the State Government to incorporate any message like that, any wording about the Governor. That is a matter.....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Where is the argument necessary? The question is this. Shri Narayana Rao has pointed out and Shri Randhir Singh has also mentioned it: I must confess that Shri Madhu Limaye has under the rules a right to offer a personal explanation, with permission of the Chair. But he has widened the scope of the personal explanation. I think he will also admit that. He has of course the right to make a personal explanation. But so far as the issue that has been raised here is concerned, the point is this. The matter is likely to crop up tomorrow. I presume all of them are serious about it. He wanted to raise the question of interpretation of that particular Article and the ambit of discretion available to the Governor in these matters. Therefore, I allowed him. Certain other issues also were raised. As I have pointed out, whatever was said regarding this matter, to avoid any crises or critical moment, that would be conveyed by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

SHRI J.M. BISWAS : Under whatever cover the issue might have come up, the fact remains that in West Bengal tomorrow some crisis is going to be created. That is a problem before the country and I request you to allow a debate on the issue. Mr. Dharma Vira should not be allowed to remain there.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am not in a position to say anything. Now, we shall continue with the railway budget discussion.

14.42 hrs.

RAILWAY BUDGET GENERAL DISCUSSION—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : How much time would Dr. Ram Subhag Singh require for reply?