

to the National Flag. In the light of the report of the Court of Inquiry, the Government of Mysore were informed of the Central Government's view that the cadets were guilty of indiscipline and had set a bad example, and that under the scheme of the NCC Act and Rules, appropriate action may be taken against the concerned cadets in consultation with the educational authorities. The majority of the cadets had, however, tendered an unconditional apology.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3117 DT. 7-8-1968 CONCERNING AN ARTICLE PUBLISHED IN THE 'OBSERVER' REGARDING NAGA REBELLION.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT) : In my reply to parts (a) and (b) of Unstarred Question No. 3117 given in the Lok Sabha on 7-8-1968, I had stated as below :

"(a) and (b). Yes, sir."

An inadvertent typographical error makes it necessary to revise the answer to that part of that Question as under:

"(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Government have no information in this matter."

12.14 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT ON PUNJAB APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS—contd.

THE MINISTER OF LAW (SHRI GOVINDA MENON) : Sir, I understand that a copy of the judgment has been circulated. My statement is rather long. If you agree I will place it on the Table, or if the House desires I will read some portion of it.

MR. SPEAKER : He may place it on the Table.

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : Sir, I lay it on the Table.

STATEMENT

Statement regarding the Judgment of the Supreme Court in the case relating to the validity of the Punjab Appropriation Acts

1. The unanimous judgment of the Supreme Court given by five Judges

on July 30, 1968 regarding the Punjab Appropriation Acts, 1968 is of great significance from the point of view *inter alia* of powers of a Presiding Officer of a Legislature. I will briefly recall the main events which led to the Supreme Court decision.

2. The Legislative Assembly of Punjab was summoned to meet on February 22, 1968. The Annual Financial Statement was discussed on March 4, 5 and 6. On the last day, a Resolution was moved expressing no-confidence in the Speaker. The House granted leave and then adjourned itself to the following day.

3. When the meeting commenced next day, one of the members raised a point of order that there was a contravention of article 179(c) of the Constitution in moving the Resolution. The Speaker declared the motion of no-confidence to be unconstitutional and deemed to have not been moved at all. Another Resolution was then moved which led to rowdy scenes. The Speaker purporting to act under rule 105 adjourned the Assembly for two months.

4. A political crisis then arose. The budget had to be adopted before March 31, 1968 but the House stood adjourned to May 6, 1968. No expenditure in the State could, therefore, be made from April 1, 1968. In order to overcome this unprecedented situation, the Governor prorogued the Assembly on March 11, 1968 under article 174(2)(a) of the Constitution. On March 13, 1968, the Governor promulgated the Punjab Legislature (Regulation of Procedure in Relation to Financial Business) Ordinance, 1968. On March 14, 1968 the Governor summoned the Legislative Assembly under Article 174 fixing March 18, 1968 for its sitting. He further sent a message under article 175(2) directing the Assembly to consider the Punjab Appropriation Bills, Demands for Grants and other financial business.

5. The Legislative Assembly met on March 18. After about three hours' discussion on a point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition the