

12.18 hrs.

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE:  
PROCLAMATION IN RELATION TO  
UTTAR PRADESH—Contd.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** We shall now proceed with the further discussion on the Resolution re: Proclamation in relation to Uttar Pradesh. We have 45 minutes, and three members are yet on the list. At what time should I call the Minister? ... I think, 2.15 p.m. will be all right. One hour may be taken up by three or four members....

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-  
TARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU  
RAMAIAH):** The Minister may be called at 2.00 p.m.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Near about 2.00 p.m.—2.10 or 2.15. If the time taken is a little more, then the other business will be postponed a little and the time for that may be extended a little to regain that loss. I think, this should be acceptable.

**Shri Shyamnandan Mishra**

मिश्रा जी, एक बात कहूँ, अगर आप गुस्ता न करे तो। आप बकन लीजिये, हम के दिनांक से मंही जा रहा हूँ जा यहा दिया है 8 मिनट। लेकिन आप खुद जरा ध्यान रखिये।

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA** (Begusarai): This development in Uttar Pradesh highlights the tragedy of a party physically substantial but spiritually bankrupt. It proves that though the ruling Party has the body of an elephant, it has the spirit of a mouse and the elephantine body and the mousy spirit cannot go together.. (Interruptions). I have been a student of English literature and I know there is an adjective like 'mousy'.

Now, it is as clear as daylight that the whole massive edifice of the ruling party was built on sands and it is collapsing almost everyday. And, if

they cannot run a government with a strength of 272 in a House of 421, the conclusion is clear that they cannot run this country with a strength of 370 in a House of 526 or 527. This is a clear admission that this Party lacks the capacity to run the country, to run democracy. In fact, UP has sounded the tocsin, warning to all of us that democracy is not safe in their hands, that legislative or parliamentary majority does not equal political stability, that strength is not a function of numbers but of the quality behind the numbers, of the discipline, strength and character behind the number, of the policies on which the number is built and the policies which the number is capable of implementing. That has been made absolutely plain by the developments in Uttar Pradesh.

This makes us wonder what would happen if a similar contingency arose at the Centre and if the Party in power threw up its hands, threw up the sponge and said that it could not run the administration of the country. You may say that the President can ask the Government to remain in power as a care-taker Government and then ask the country to go to polls. But, then there is no constitutional obligation on the outgoing Government to function as the care-taker Government. Can any constitutional pundit tell me that there is a constitutional obligation cast on the outgoing Government to remain as care-taker Government and if the outgoing Government refuses to function as a care-taker Government, what is the provision in the Constitution to meet such a contingency? Therefore, I would say that we have now to address ourselves to this task not as a remote possibility, but as a political threat to our democracy.

I have absolutely no manner of doubt that it is not the failure of an individual in the UP, the individual

called Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi, but it was the failure of the Party as a whole. Had it been the failure of an individual, the Party which has such a massive numerical strength could have elected another leader in his place. But the Party was so thoroughly demoralised and paralysed that it refused to elect another leader in the place of Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi and thus it announced to the whole wide world that there was something rotten in the State of Denmark, that the failure was collective and total, that the failure was not partial but it was indeed the total collapse of a Party.

Look at the pathetic appeal made by the outgoing Chief Minister? He thought that the state of affairs in the UP could be improved by the Centre temporarily taking over the administration of the State. No one knows it better than Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi that things are no better at the Centre, at Delhi than they are in Lucknow. Yet, the outgoing Chief Minister was made to make this pathetic appeal under duress.

It is said that this was the resignation of the outgoing Chief Minister Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi. I think there could not be a greater subterfuge than this. It is absolutely clear that it was a case of dismissal. The supreme leader at Delhi wanted the resignation of the outgoing Chief Minister. Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi had many faults; I have no doubt that he had many faults, and many defects in his administration too. But Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi wanted to stand up to the supreme leader. So, Delhi wanted to carry out a coup in Lucknow. It is nothing less than a coup carried out by Delhi in Lucknow. Mr. Kamalapati Tripathi has gone on record as saying umpteen times that he was not going to resign. He said so two or three times before coming to Delhi. But when he comes to Delhi he is asked, to behave, he is asked to resign. And

he goes back to Lucknow and then on the 12th of June he sends in his resignation. It was therefore, not the resignation of the Chief Minister, it was the virtual dismissal of the Chief Minister Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi.

Sir, we have been talking about the many ills and miseries from which this Pradesh is suffering. The main reason for all the miseries and all the ills of this State lies in the fact that there was a dual rule in U.P.—the role of Chief Minister No. 1 Shrimati Indira Gandhi and the rule of Chief Minister No. 2 Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi. No State is functioning under such a dual role. The *de facto* Chief Minister of UP was Shrimati Gandhi and Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi was only *de jure* Chief Minister of State. Ultimately, he said he would not fall in line with the diktat of the supreme leader. We have been reading in the newspapers that the supreme leader of Delhi wanted him to drop 11 Ministers in one stroke; the Chief Minister stood his ground saying, nothing doing, no non-sense here. He ultimately had to go away, but did not stand the non-sense of Delhi.

However, I know that this was a totally weak inefficient and even corrupt Government. But the main reason for that is that the supreme leader Shrimati Indira Gandhi divided the loyalty of the legislators in such a way that such a weak Government, inefficient Government was bound to function there. This party was bound to collapse. The moral law works inexorably. This is a party of defectors. Can anybody deny that the elephantine size was not contributed by the defectors from other parties? The ruling party had the strength of only 92 at the time of the President's election; it went up to 110 after the President's election, now it has got a strength of 272. It is so because of the power of patron-

[Shri Shyamnandan Mishra] age and financial resources that they commanded.

Now, the other day, the hon. Home Minister said, he was not collecting money. He would be proved wrong completely because he happens to be the treasurer of his party. And to what use is that money put? About that, Sir, I don't want to say anything at the moment.

The defections took place from all parties—from the party of my hon. friend, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, from the S.S.P. the major contribution had been from my party to which you must be thankful to us—from the B.K.D. and Muslim Majlis. There could not be a more, real zoo than the party that you have put up. Therefore, it is not surprising that the people in that State were suffering so terrifically. I shed no tears—none should—that such a Government has gone. And yet I say that it is a blatant misuse of the Constitution for the aggrandisement of the ruling party, for the sake of the narrow interests of the ruling party. It could be done only by a party which has a scant regard for the Constitution and which is hell-bent to disaster. Article 356, according to my reading of it, was never meant for misuse of this kind. Article 356 is not a 'clinic' or 'rehabilitation' clause of the Constitution. This was never meant for the hospitalisation of party, for the hospitalisation of a sick party and a sick Chief Minister so that when he recovers, he can come back. We of course knew of the hospitalisation of the sick mills, which passes for nationalisation, under the present regime. But we have never known of the hospitalisation of a sick party and a sick Chief Minister.

Article 356 is being used as a device per suspension—let me make it clear—of Assembly. Suspension of Assembly is indeed diabolical. It is bad Constitutionally the only clean and straight course is dissolution.

So, we demand that the Assembly should not remain suspended any more and that it should be dissolved right now, and let the ruling party go to the country. But, this party has no courage to go to the people to seek their mandate. It had a strength of 272; if they can not run the Government with this strength, with what face are they going to seek the mandate from the people? Can anyone say that they are going to get greater strength than they had? May I tell you that a very important meeting is said to have taken place on the 29th of last month between the Prime Minister and some of her advisers here? Many of the advisers told her: 'Madam, you are in an excellent position. You are going to get 80 per cent of the seats.' But the madam is very realistic. She asked: 'But, what has happened in the election in KABAL towns? In the panchayat election what happened? What has happened in the Pramukh election? In all these they have failed miserably. That is what the Prime Minister thought.'

My further submission would be now I am making a demand for the dissolution of this Assembly let not this thoroughly discredited and rotten ministry be brought back to power. We would like the Government to note that there is going to be stiff opposition to any such move.

**SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GO-SWAMI (Gauhati):** Can you improve your language?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** 'Rotten ministry' is not a bad language. It was, in my humble opinion, not right of the Governor to have extolled the services of the outgoing Chief Minister and to have agreed with him that it was an act of self-abnegation on his part. The Governor knows this, and probably, the Governor was a party to it, that the Chief Minister was made to resign. The truth has been stated in the report.

If the Chief Minister wanted to resign and the Governor also thought that it was a moral duty on the part of the Chief Minister to resign, then the appropriate time for him was the 20th May when the Lucknow University was set on fire and the P.A.C. had revolted.

But the Governor did not insist on that, nor did the supreme leader insist upon that on that occasion, so that the outgoing Chief Minister had been placed in a ridiculous position.

Now, it sounds all the more pathetic that the outgoing Chief Minister recommended to the Governor that the suspension of the Assembly should be temporary. If the suspension of the Assembly becomes temporary, then the position of the Governor is reduced to that of a *durwan*, the outgoing Chief Minister saying 'Close the door when I go out, and open the door when I come in'. Now, would you like....

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT): I do not think that it is proper on his part to use the expression '*durwan*' and liken the Governor to a '*durwan*'.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I have not likened him to a *durwan*....

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Mishra should not reflect on the Governor in this fashion.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: He should know nicety of language.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: In fact, I am trying to safeguard the dignity of this great office, and it is out of my solicitude for this great office that I ask the Government not to permit the use of article 356 in a manner that would make the position of the Governor that of a *durwan*.

It is Shyamnandan Mishra who is trying to save the dignity of the great office.

I have not used any wrong expression. Let anybody be asked. Let Prof. Mukerjee be asked.

MR. SPEAKER: Why does he involve Prof. Mukerjee in this?

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East): He is perfectly all right, if I may be permitted to say so.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I was saying that that would reduce his position. I did not want that his position should be reduced to that. I really do not know why hon. Members are so hypersensitive and exhibit almost a kind of feudal sensitivity in this matter. Democracy does not function in such an atmosphere.

अध्यक्ष महोदय आप गवर्नर को दरबान न कहिये ।

श्री श्री दल बिहारी राजपूरी (स्वातियर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, सच्चाई यह है कि अगर कोई दरबान की बातों पर आपत्ति करे, तो समझ में आ सकता है । राज्यपाल के बारे में आपत्ति करने की जरूरत नहीं है । राज्यपाल इनके हाथों का खिलाता बन गया है । यह मजाक का विषय बन गया है । कोई स्वाभिमानों आदमी इनके अलतर्गन राज्यपाल बनना पसन्द नहीं करेगा ।

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: My submission, however, is that the Governor must not be asked to open the door for this thoroughly discredited and rotten Ministry.

अध्यक्ष महोदय आपने सब कुछ कह कर बाद में यह कह दिया है कि हम गवर्नर की डिगिटी को सेफगार्ड करना चाहते हैं ।

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : हम यहाँ श्री यहीं कहेंगे, जब नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन आयेगा।

This is what we are meant for.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह कौन सा दरगाजा है ?

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : फिर से मिनिसट्री को ले आने का।

Now, I am summing up and saying that he must not open the door for this thoroughly discredited and rotten Ministry

I am perfectly in order. What else am I expected to say?

MR SPEAKER: That door is opened by the members of the House and not the Governor

AN HON MEMBER: No, Sir

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA  
The Assembly should be dissolved immediately. Let us go to the polls and let UP be the test case. We have absolutely no manner of doubt that the people are going to give a massive verdict against this Government which has been a massive failure.

यह तो बिल्कुल ऐसी भाषा है कि इसके बारे में आप कुछ नहीं कह सकते।

श्री राज स्वरूप (रावर्ट्सगज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उत्तर प्रदेश में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करने के संबंध में मंत्री जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है, मैं इस का समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। उत्तर प्रदेश में राष्ट्रपति शासन अभी लागू हुआ, इस के बारे में उन्होंने विस्तार से चर्चा की थी . . . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ने "दरवान" शब्द तो वापस ले लिया था ?

श्री श्याम नन्दन मिश्र . जी नहीं।

It would reduce the post of the Governor to that of a *Jurwan*. I can speak on it if any attempt is made to take it off the record. There is nothing wrong about it. It must be on record.

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस को देखूँगा और आप से बात करूँगा कि हो सभता है या नहीं हो सकता है।

श्री राज स्वरूप : राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू होने के पूर्व उत्तर प्रदेश का प्रशासन बहुत अच्छे ढंग से चल रहा था। वहाँ पर कांग्रेस का प्रबल बहुमत था - हम में कोई दो राय नहीं हो सकती। पिछले दो-ढाई गणों में वहाँ प्रदेशीय शासन जिस रूप में चल रहा था, वह किसी भी अन्य प्रदेश में किसी भावने में कम नहीं था और उस शासन को किसी भी तरह से "रीटन" या अन्य किसी शब्द से सम्बोधित नहीं किया जा सकता। उत्तर प्रदेश शासन के लिए एक बहुत बड़ी निन्दनीय बात होगी कि इस तरह का रूटि-फिकेट हम उन काँ दे, जिस क अभी श्री श्याम नन्दन जी मिश्र ने दिया है।

वहाँ पिछले दो-ढाई सालों में जो विकास हुआ है, वह पहले कभी नहीं हुआ था। चाहे ग्राम विद्युत्करण की योजना हो, सिंचाई की योजना हो, भूमि सुधार के सम्बन्ध में जो विकास हुए हैं, वे पहले के सत्रियदलों के मुकाबले बहुत अधिक हुए हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में यह कहना कि कुछ हुआ ही नहीं, वहाँ की मिनिसट्री को रीटन कहना, इसी लिए उस को डिस्मिस किया गया - यह गलत बात है। वहाँ एंम काँ ई श्री शिवायत नहीं थी, जिस से कि उन काँ हम तरह से सम्बोधित किया जाय।

यह जो राष्ट्र-पति शासन लागू हुआ है, उस के तहत वहाँ पर कुछ सलाहकार रखे गये हैं जो वहाँ के शासन को चलाने में राज्य-पाल की सहायता करते हैं। इस लिए इस शासन की सार्थकता, उपयोगिता तथा सामने आयेगी, जब वहाँ की स्थिति में कुछ सुधार होगा। जैसा बतलाया गया है— वहाँ विद्युत् की कमी हो गई थी, अकाल ने तो वहाँ की आर्थिक स्थिति को काफी बिगाड़ दिया था, अन्तःशासनहीनता ने भी स्थिति को काफी बिगाड़ा — इन्हीं सब कारणों से राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करने की सिफारिश की गई थी ताकि वहाँ की स्थिति में सुधार हो जाय। अब देखना यह है कि इस समय जो शासन चल रहा है, जो सिलमिला वहाँ काम कर रहा है, वे अपने प्रयास में कितने सफल होते हैं। हम प्रदेश को इस स्थिति में ला दें कि वह अच्छी तरह से काम कर सके और भूखमरी से जो जिले पीड़ित हैं उन को राहत पहुँचा सके।

मैं बहुत ज्यादा हम पर चर्चा न कर के गृह मंत्री जी से यही अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ कि उस प्रदेश में चाहे बिजली की योजना हो सिंचाई की योजना हो, चाहे भूमि सुधार को लागू करने की योजना हो, या दूसरी विकास योजनाएँ हो उन में सलाहकार और राज्यपाल अपने प्रभाव का उपयोग करके केन्द्र सरकार से उत्तर प्रदेश को उचित अधिकार दिलाने की चेष्टा करें और वहाँ की स्थिति से, कठिन स्थिति से उबारने का प्रयास किया जाय। हमने देखा है कि पूर्वी जिले — जिन की संख्या 12 है, हमेशा दूसरे तीसरे साल अकाल से पीड़ित हो जाते हैं। लेकिन इस साल मानसून आने में जो देरी हुई, उस से 23 जिले प्रभावित हो गये। करोड़ों लोगों के सामने काम की और दूसरी तकलीफें आ गई थी, वहाँ की भदई फसल चौपट हो गई थी, भाज भी वहाँ के बहुत से जिलों में लोगों के पास खाने के लिए अनाज नहीं है, जितना गला वहाँ पहुँचना चाहिए

था, उतना नहीं पहुँच पाया है। हालाँकि वहाँ पर कुछ दुकानें खुली हुई हैं, जो सस्ते दामों पर अनाज बेचने के लिए हैं, लेकिन उन के द्वारा रेगुलर सप्लाई नहीं हो पा रही है, जिस में वहाँ के लोगों में भूखमरी की भावना हो जाती है — प्रशासन को इस चीज को देखना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं भी उन पूर्वी जिलों से आता हूँ। मेरा जिला मिर्जापुर है, जहाँ पीने के पानी का बहुत अभाव है। इस अभाव को दूर करने के लिए सोन नदी पर लिफ्ट-स्कीम की योजना थी, जिस पर 17 करोड़ रुपये खर्च आना था। 100 करोड़ रुपये भी इस योजना को एक अच्छी योजना बतलाया था, लेकिन अभी तक वह मजूर नहीं हुई है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस को मजूर करके शीघ्र चालू किया जाय ताकि उस धाँत की कठिनाई दूर हो सके।

मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति शासन वहाँ की कठिन परिस्थितियों का मुकाबला करते हुए सफल होगा, तथा मैं ममझूंगा कि देश में राष्ट्रपति शासन उपयोगी रहा।

श्री भव सिन्धु (बाबा) अध्यक्ष महोदय उत्तर प्रदेश में जो घटनाएँ घटी हैं उन में एक बात बिलकुल साफ हो जाती है कि वहाँ खलकरी सविधान की हत्या की गई है और लोकतन्त्र का गला काटा गया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय उत्तर प्रदेश के गवर्नर के द्वारा राष्ट्रपति जी को जो पत्र लिखा गया है उस की ओर हम सदन का ध्यान नहीं गया है। यदि उस पत्र को ठीक तरह यह सदन देखेगा तो उसे पता चलेगा कि उस में ऐसे सिद्धान्तों का निरूपण किया गया है कि जो लोकतन्त्र प्रणाली में और हमारे सविधान के बिलकुल खिलाफ है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं केवल दो जूमसे गवर्नर साहब के पत्र से आप के सामने उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ —

[श्री मधु लिमये]

"The resignation gives detailed reasons and is coupled with the recommendation that I should request you to exercise your powers under article 356 of the Constitution and to take over the administration of the State for a temporary period"

भाग चल कर गवर्नर साहब श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी की इस सिफारिश को स्वीकार करते हैं और कहते हैं -

"There is one other aspect of the matter. The advice as to the alternative arrangements having been tendered by the Council of Ministers while continuing to enjoy an absolute majority in the Legislative Assembly, I should be loath to reject it except for compelling reasons."

इस का मतलब है कि श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी को राष्ट्रपति शासन जारी करने की सिफारिश करने का अधिकार है - यह गवर्नर साहब मानते हैं और इतना ही नहीं, बल्कि त्रिपाठी सरकार का विधान सभा में बहुमत था, इस लिए उन की सिफारिश को मैं ठकरा नहीं सकता, यह भी गवर्नर साहब कहते हैं। कुछ साल पहले स्पीकर कांफ्रेंस हुई थी और इस के बारे में अब दो रायें नहीं हैं कि बहुमत वाली सरकार का मुख्य मंत्री अपनी कैबिनेट की सलाह से विधान सभा को बरखास्त कर के नये चुनाव कराने की सलाह राज्यपाल को दे सकता है। राज्यपाल को वह सलाह माननी पड़ेगी। इंग्लैंड में भी यही परिपाटी है और हमारे देश में स्पीकर कांफ्रेंस ने और इस सदन ने भी कई बार इस सिद्धान्त को माना है। लेकिन अब यह कौन सा नया लोकतांत्रिक सिद्धान्त या रहा है कि लोकतांत्रिक सरकार समाप्त करो, सविधान की हत्या करो, लोकसभ का गला घोटो,

ऐसा कहने का मुख्य मंत्री को अधिकार है। ऐसी सलाह देने का मुख्य मंत्री को कब से अधिकार प्राप्त हो गया? यह कौन सी परिपाटी है? क्या मंत्री महोदय इस बात का समर्थन करते हैं कि यह नई परिपाटी हमारे देश में अब कायम होने जा रही है कि लोकतन्त्र को खत्म करने की सलाह भी मुख्य मंत्री दे सकते हैं - यद्यपि उन का राज्य विधान सभा में बहुमत हो।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस लिए मैं मानता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति शासन जारी करने के लिए गवर्नर साहब ने यह जो मुख्य कारण बतलाया है कि बहुमत वाली सरकार के मुख्य मंत्री ने इस्तीफा दिया और इस्तीफा देते समय उन्होंने यह सलाह दी कि मैं राष्ट्रपति को सिफारिश करूँ कि वह राष्ट्रपति शासन जारी करे -

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह बिल्कुल लोकतन्त्र विरोधी काम है और भविष्य में इस तरह का काम नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं तो यह चाहूँगा कि राज्यपाल के इस काम के बारे में इस सदन में बाकायदा प्रस्ताव आना चाहिए और आप को हम लोगों को मौका देना चाहिए कि इस की हम लोग निन्दा करें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय प्रस्ताव आपके सामने है।

श्री मधु लिमये यह अलग है। यह बिल ऐस्टेबलिशमेंट बिल है कि बहुमत वाले दल का मुख्य मंत्री अपनी कैबिनेट की सलाह से विधान सभा बरखास्त करने और नये चुनाव कराने की राय दे सकता है। लेकिन किसी भी हालत में लोकतांत्रिक सरकार को समाप्त करने की सलाह वह नहीं दे सकता।

उत्तर प्रदेश में एक बात स्पष्ट हो गयी कि अब तक कहा जा रहा था कि यह जो त्रिपुली सरकारें हैं अनेक दलों की यह स्वच्छ और स्थिर शासन नहीं दे सकती एक दलीय सरकार ही यह कर सकती है, यह बेमतलब है।

इन्दिरा गांधी ने 1972 के चुनाव में और 1969 के मध्यावधि चुनाव में मनदाताओं से यह कहा कि चूकि मिलीजुनी सरकारें स्थिर शासन नहीं दे सकती हैं इसलिए एक दलीय शासन चाहिए, और अकेली कांग्रेस पार्टी ही ऐसी पार्टी है जो देश को एक दलीय शासन दे सकती है। आन्ध्र प्रदेश में एक दलीय शासन हुआ, उत्तर प्रदेश में इतना विशाल बहुमत विधान सभामें है कि आज जिस भी बिरोधी दल से इस सरकार के अस्तित्व को खतरा नहीं है। लेकिन फिर भी राष्ट्रपति शासन आन्ध्र प्रदेश में और उत्तर प्रदेश में कायम किया गया है, जिससे स्थिर सरकार का नारा बिल्कुल धोखा साबित हुआ है; अब मनदाताओं को समझ लेना चाहिए कि केवल एक दल वाली बात भी निरर्थक साबित हुई है। राष्ट्रपति शासन से यह बिल्कुल साफ हो गया है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी इतनी निकम्मी पार्टी है कि विशाल बहुमत देने के बाद भी वह सरकार चलाने को स्थिति में नहीं है। स्वच्छ और स्थिर शासन की बात नो भ्रमण है।

उत्तर प्रदेश न देश को तीन प्रधान मंत्री दिये और डप के एवज में उत्तर प्रदेश को क्या मिला? गरीबी और शोषण का अनावा कुछ नहीं मिला।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, केवल चार तथ्य चार मुद्दों में उत्तर प्रदेश को बार में रखना चाहता हूँ। पहला यह कि 1960 से 1970 तक ही के बीच न कांग्रेस सरकार में और केन्द्र की सरकार ने उत्तर प्रदेश में निरक्षरों की संख्या में तकरीबन 90 लाख की वृद्धि करायी।

दूसरा यह कि उत्तर प्रदेश में फ्री व्यक्ति जो शोषित आमदनी है और भारत की जो फ्री व्यक्ति शोषित आमदनी है, दोनों की तुलना करने तो भारत की शोषित आमदनी से अधिक तो है ही नहीं, लेकिन 25 प्रतिशत उत्तर प्रदेश की पर कौंपिटा इन्कम अखिल भारतीय औद्योगिक से कम है, और वह घटती

जा रही है। अक्ष महोदय, 1960-61 में यह अनुपात 0 प्रतिशत था। आज यह घट कर 75 प्रतिशत हो गया। यानी पहले 20 प्रतिशत कम था आज 25 प्रतिशत कम है।

तीसरे का अयोग्यता का सम्बन्ध में मेरा तीसरा तर्क यह है कि उत्तर प्रदेश गेहूँ, मक्का, अरहर और चीनी सब से अधिक पैदा करता है तो देश की अर्थ की सफर्या के ऊपर उत्तर प्रदेश में क्या होना है उस का क्या असर होता है। लेकिन आखिर भारत में जो खेती के उत्पादन की वृद्धि की दर है उस से उत्तर प्रदेश के उत्पादन वृद्धि की दर एक प्रतिशत कम रही है, और

चौथी बात यह है कि विगत 18 सालों में जब से अधिक नियोजन शुरू हो गया केन्द्र के द्वारा जो सहायता विभिन्न राज्यों को दी गयी उस में उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार का नम्बर सब से आखिर में रहा। 99 रु० की व्यक्ति सहायता बिहार को 17 सालों में मिली और उत्तर प्रदेश को 101 रु० जब कि दूसरे राज्यों को 200, 250, 300, 350, 400 रु० दी गयी। तीसरे से पता चलता है कि उत्तर प्रदेश की अपेक्षा की गयी है।

केन्द्र में कांग्रेसी शासन रहा और 10, 12 महीने छोड़ कर उत्तर प्रदेश में भी कांग्रेसी प्रशासन या केन्द्र का राष्ट्रपति शासन रहा और उत्तर प्रदेश की इस बीच में यह हानन हो गयी। विगत 1, 2 वर्षों में विश्वविद्यालयों को भी चौपट कर दिया गया।

अब यह अयोग्यता प्राप्त यकीन जानिये कि जो आपकी पार्टी का हिस्सा था समय का उम्र से ठाई तीन गुना ज्यादा समय आप को दिया।

श्री मधु लिनये हर बात नम्बर के ऊपर नहीं चलती है। मैं 5 मिनट में खत्म करता हूँ।



अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन की कुव्ववस्था के कारण उत्तर प्रदेश के बिन्विबिवालय चौपट हो गये। सभी जगह पुलिस, पी० ए० सी० और सी० आर० पी० लगा रहे हैं। जब पी० ए० सी० मुसलमानों को शेटता थी, छात्रों पर लाठी चलाती थी, मजदूर आन्दोलन को बचाती थी, तब तक पी० ए० सी० के जवानों के बारे में कहा जाता था कि वह बड़े अनुशासित हैं। लेकिन जब उन्होंने आई० जी० पी० से ही प्रेरणा पा कर, उन की सहानुभूति से अपना ऐसोमिशन बनाने का फसला किया और अपने अधिकारों के बारे में वह जागरूक होने लगे, वह कहें लगे कि अफसरों के बूट पालिश करना हमारा काम नहीं है, अफसरों के जानवरों के लिये घास काट कर लाना हमारा काम नहीं है, समाजों में इन्दिरा गांधी जिन्दाबाद का नारा देना हमारा काम नहीं है, जब आगे यह कहा कि छात्रों पर बर्बरता के साथ हम लाठी नहीं चलायेगे, अ पसक्यकों को नहीं पीटेंगे तो तत्काल कहा गया कि यह विद्रोही बन गये। और उन की ओर से एक ध० ध्यान अखबार में छपने नहीं दिया गया। पहली बार माननीय के० सी० पन्त के बयान से मालूम हुआ कि "विद्रोह" किया गया है।

अभी अभी खाद के बारे में आप ने सुना होगा कि फ़ैजाबाद के शिपो में लाखों रुपये का गवन हुआ है। फ़ाटलाइजर के बारे में मैं ऐसे पचासों मामले रख सकता हूँ। मंत्री महोदय से मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इन बातों के बारे में कोई खलासा इन के पास है? और राष्ट्रपति शासन लोकतांत्रिक सरकार की कमी भी जगह नहीं ले सकता है। इसलिये मेरी मांग है कि विधान सभा जो निरन्तर आप ने रखा है यह अवस्था नहीं है। आप विधान सभा को तत्काल बरुस्ति कीजिये, राज्यपाल को बरुस्ति क्यों कि उन्होंने ने संविधान की मानहानि की है और तत्काल उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव कराइये ताकि इस निकामी पार्टी को वहाँ

से निकाल बाहर करने का जोका उत्तर प्रदेश की जनता को मिल सके।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: मंत्री जी को 2 16 वा 2 15 पर बोलना है। राय बीरेन्द्र सिंह जी, आप 10 मिनट लेगे? अभी लगे या बाद में? अगर अभी लेना है तो आप उठ खड़े होइये, उन के बाद हम लंच को चलते हैं।

**SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO** (Mahendragarh): I would request that the time may be extended....

**MR. SPEAKER:** Enough time has already been taken.

**SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO:** I will mention one thing. Yesterday's incident was very sad. Seven Members from the Treasury Benches consecutively spoke. This has never happened before.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You are forgetting how many Members spoke from the other side.

**SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO:** Very few. The time was not properly distributed.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That is not so. The time is quite properly distributed. You will have 10 minutes. After that, the Minister will reply.

**SHRI NARENDRA SINGH BISHT** (Almora): Will I have some time to speak?

अध्यक्ष महोदय: मैं ने ए० डेडलाइन सैट की है कि 2 10 पर या 1, 2 मिनट ऊपर हो जाय तो कोई हर्ज नहीं है, मंत्री जो रिप्लाय देंगे क्यों कि उन्हें काफी समय लेना है।

13. hrs.

**SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO** (Mahendragarh): Under the Constitution emergency powers of the Pre-

sident in article 356 are invoked whenever administration in a State fails or the Government of the State cannot be run according to the Constitution. Presidential rule has been imposed in Uttar Pradesh. I do not say that there was any other alternative, but, Sir, the stand taken by the Government is very inconsistent. If Government had admitted clearly that the administration in the State had failed completely and Government by the people could not be carried on, we would have been happy, and that is the only condition for imposition of Presidential rule. But the Government has been saying that Presidential rule has been imposed in spite of the overwhelming majority of the ruling party because of famine conditions, because the PAC constabulary rose in revolt and they have to be disciplined. They are not very clear about the Constitutional provisions

Many hon. members in this House have said things which are correct. They have justified the Presidential rule by saying that the State of Uttar Pradesh has been a sick State for a long time, that the administration could not be carried on there. I toured Uttar Pradesh two months back. What I heard from the people was that there was *Brashtachar ka raj*, there was *dacoits' raj*, in Uttar Pradesh; nobody amongst the common people ever said that it was Pandit Kamalapati Tripathi's Government or it was Congress Government; or people's government, it was anybody else's Government in U.P. but not Congress or Pandit Tripathi's Government. I would not say what other names were used for this Government....

**MR. SPEAKER:** The hon. Member will continue after Lunch. He will continue for ten minutes and after that, the Minister will reply. The Minister will start his reply at 2.10 p.m.

We adjourn for Lunch to reassemble at 2.00 p.m.

13.02 hrs.

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

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

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE.  
PROCLAMATION IN RELATION TO  
UTTAR PRADESH -Contd.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]  
Birender Singh Rao.

**SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO:** I was saying that it was agreed that Presidential rule in UP was inevitable. For the past many years Uttar Pradesh could be aptly described as 'utter chaos'. Administration has failed. Corruption was rampant. Development works did not make any progress. People were suffering from famines and floods and the very foundation of the civil authority of a popular government had collapsed. The Police of the State on which rests a government, an elected government of the people, rose in revolt. But the people have a suspicion and it is being talked that the imposition of the Presidential rule in UP in spite of all these conditions was politically motivated. There are good reasons for that. Specially after 1967, this Article 356 was used by the Central Government in some cases where a popular government was running a State and where there was majority with the government in the legislature. In Haryana, a real government of the people, a popular government was ruling the State but all of a sudden, for no rhyme or reason, on absolutely lame excuses, for the mistakes which the Congress had committed in inducing people to defect, the Government was blamed, the

[Shri Birander Singh Rao]  
 whole Assembly was blamed and it was dissolved. In the same way, the same day, a popular government in West Bengal was dissolved in November 1967. Now in U.P. perhaps this action of the Government would have drawn praise from all sections if it had been taken in time. When the Army was used to suppress a Police revolt, then definitely Art 356 was attracted. I would have been very happy if before sending the Army to fight against the Police, before sending the Indian military forces to use their arms against their Indian brothers of the armed police, they had imposed the Presidential rule and dissolved the Assembly. Even now, the Assembly is not dissolved. It is kept in an animated suspension. The Assembly is kept in a similar suspension in Andhra Pradesh. There is no provision in the Constitution for keeping an Assembly in animated suspension for over six months. The Constitution is clear that if the Assembly does not meet in six months, it stands dissolved. It goes. But in Andhra it is continuing. I would like to know from the hon. Home Minister why and under what provisions of the Constitution it is done. If the government in U.P. and if the Assembly of U.P. State was not fit to rule with the popular will of the people behind them and was not fit to administer the State, will they be fit now after the MLAs and Ministers had rested for a while? If the Chief Minister of U.P. had been given respite for three or four months, can you say that he will become an efficient man? To my mind, the Government is beating about the bush. They are not facing the real problem. They are fighting shy of admitting the fact and the real malady of the sickening state of affairs in U.P. They are not looking deeper into the causes. The real cause is that this State is such a large State that cannot be properly administered. There are 55 districts. I will request you to ask the hon.

Minister who himself belongs to U.P. whether he can name all the 55 districts of U.P. He would not be able to remember half the names. Yet, he is administering that State from Delhi. Is this vast sprawling state not bigger than our neighbouring countries? It is bigger than Bangla Desh. It is much bigger than Nepal. It is much bigger than Pakistan. It is next to a continent, the continent of Australia, in population. Such a large State cannot be properly administered as one single unit. That is why it is suffering from famines. That is why it is suffering from floods. That is why the administration has failed. That is why the people are dissatisfied. The police force in the State is so large that it can take up arms against the army. Why not divided it? Why not allow the people to make progress like other small States like Haryana and Punjab? Other States have been created on the basis of history, culture, language and administrative convenience. Why not divide it into Brij Pradesh for the the Brij Bhasha speaking people and Oudh for the Eastern UP? They were clubbed by the British. Why should the people continue to be punished even after independence? Why should it remain a single large State? For that there are political reasons. (Interruptions) Vishal Haryans—if you do not like, do not make it now. But it will come one day. One day you will be forced to accept Vishal Haryana as a reasonable demand. You will be forced to divide UP and it is only because it is too big a State. As it is a large State it requires also a leader of a great stature, but the Congress Party has not been able to provide a leader of such a big stature as UP needs. The State is so big that they cannot find a suitable leader. Perhaps the Prime Minister could have ruled the State properly, but the Centre needs her....

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Instead of Tripathi's rule, Rashtrapati rule has come!

**SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO:** Rashtrapati rule is only in the name. If Mr. K. P. Tripathi has failed and if other Chief Ministers before him have failed and if they cannot find a man, why should you allow the people to suffer perpetually? Why cannot they divide it and declare here and now that UP will be divided and the people will be given a chance to make speedy progress and the administration will be toned up.

There are only one or two points more and I will finish. It has been an accepted principle that under the Presidential rule, major policy decisions will not be taken. But we have seen in UP the Governor of the State passes an order imposing the language of Urdu in the schools, ordering all Government employees to learn Urdu and pass a test in Urdu within three months. I am not opposed to Urdu. I like the language and I myself studied Urdu and I would like it to make progress. But if it is imposed, there is bound to be a reaction. UP has been a Hindi-speaking State and Hindi has been the State language. Now to make this change and later on, if the people and the elected representative of the people want to change this decision, it will be quite embarrassing to them. It is not the Governor who goes there for votes..

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Can you tell me if all these arguments are in support or against the Proclamation?

**SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO:** I am only appealing to the Home Minister that while there is this Presidential rule in U.P, he should not allow this rule to be misused by certain people and should not allow the whims of a Governor to have its way because it is not justified. . .

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Ultimately you support the Proclamation?

**SHRI BIRENDER SINGH RAO:** I support the Presidential rule because it is unavoidable. But they should admit and accept the failure

and they should dissolve the Assembly and hold elections because the Assembly cannot be suspended as its leaders have failed and in two or three months' time they cannot become of efficient administrators. That is why I said that this Presidential rule period should not be used for political decisions, to try and attract more votes of a particular section. I mentioned this because this is not an isolated incident. This has been happening and in the name of language and secularism people's sentiments are being exploited. Sometime ago, we heard that certain section of the people refused to accept *Vande Mataram* on religious grounds. Taking their cue from this (*Interruptions*)... secularism should not mean opposition to religion... This goes a long way. It has its repercussions very wide. Taking its cue from the decision of the UP Government, the neighbouring State of Bihar went one step further. The Government there placed a ban on all rites, prayers and religious ceremonies in public functions and in opening ceremonies. These things are bound to injure the feelings of a vast majority of the people in the country. So, it is now the Parliament's responsibility, the Home Minister's responsibility, who belongs to UP, to see that during this period of the Presidential rule, nothing happens in UP which is fundamentally opposed to the policies so far followed by the people's representatives in that State.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** It was announced by the Speaker before Inch that immediately after Shri Birender Singh Rao finishes his speech, the Home Minister would be called. Even so, I have a letter from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs requesting very earnestly that three more members may be accommodated—two from the Congress and one from the Opposition. If you agree, I will give them five minutes each and then I will call the Minister... (*Interruptions*). I know, but if Mem-

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]  
 bers want, we cannot be too rigid.  
 We will call the Minister after that.

Also I would like to say that in case somehow we overstep the limit of 3 pm., we shall continue with this debate until we finish it and then take up the next item, maybe a little after that.

Shri Raj Deo Singh.

श्री राजदेव सिंह (जौनपुर) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, गृह मंत्रीजी ने जोस्टैंडवूटरी रेजोल्यूशन उत्तर प्रदेश के प्रेजिडेंट रूल के बारे में रखा है और जिस पर दो दिन से बहस चल रही है— मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

विरोध पक्ष के बहुत से लोगो ने तरह तरह की बातें कही हैं, श्री श्यामानन्दन मिश्रा जी ने कहा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी डिफैक्टर्स की पार्टी है। दूसरी विरोधी पार्टियां जिनमें लोग कांग्रेस में आये हैं—श्री मिश्रा जी की उनमें पूछना चाहिये—कि वे लोग क्यों छोड़ कर आये हैं। जहां तक हमें मालूम है, उन लोगो का स्टेटमेंट है कि वे पार्टियां सब गई हैं और हम प्रोग्रेसिव विचारो के हैं ये प्रोग्रेसिव विचार हमें कांग्रेस के भीतर मिलते हैं, दूसरी पार्टियों में नहीं मिलते हैं, इसलिये छोड़कर आये हैं। उन्होंने और भी बहुत सी बातें कही हैं, अगर उन सब बातों का निचोड़ निकाला जाय—विरोधी पक्ष के लोगो की दलीलों का—तो वे एक-दूसरे को काटते हैं। हम तो इतना जानते हैं कि आज अगर इन पार्टियों की हुकूमत बहा पर होती तो जिस तरह की बातें आज वे करते हैं, उस तरह की बातें न करते।

आज जो स्थिति बहा पदा हुई है—बह पी० ए० सी० के रिबोल्ट की बजह से पैदा हुई है। पी० ए० सी० का रिबोल्ट एक-दो दिव की की बात नहीं थी, सालो से कुछ दिक्कतें थी, कुछ उनके ऊंचे अफसरों का बर्ताव अच्छा नहीं था—ये सब एकुमुलेटिड फॅक्ट्स

हैं जिनकी बजह से रिबोल्ट हुआ, उसी समय सभानक यूनिवर्सिटी में हड़ताल चल रही थी, जिससे उन्हें शह मिली।

जहां तक यूनिवर्सिटीज में विद्यार्थियों के अनरेस्ट का मवाल है, जाहिर बात है कि यूनिवर्सिटीज से अगर पोलिटिक्स को दूर कर दिया जाय, पोलिटिकल ऐलीमेंट्स जो एडमिशन लेते हैं खामख्वाह इलेक्शन लड़ने के लिये उन्हें भ्रमगकरदिया जाय और सेलेक्टिव एडमिशन यूनिवर्सिटीजों में लागू कर दिया जाय तो आज जो हमें बहा तमाशा देखने को मिलता है यह सब खत्म हो जायेगा और विद्यार्थी पढ़ेंगे और अच्छी तरह से पाम करेंगे।

दूसरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हू वह यह है कि प्रेसोडेंट रूल 13 जून को हुआ उस समय डाउट नहीं था क्योंकि यू० पी० में ज्यादातर मानसून का र्ज। वक्त है वह 20 जून के बाद में होता है और 13 जून को प्रेसोडेंट रूल लागू किया गया और विरोधी पार्टियों ने भी यह कहा कि कोई कास्टी-द्यूशनल ब्रैक डाउन नहीं था। हा एक सीरियस मिचुएगन बहा पैदा हुई जिमकी बजह से सेन्ट्रल गवर्नमेंट को हस्तक्षेप करना पडा और अपनी ही पार्टी के बहुत बड़ी मंजोरिटी में लोग थे, यह कांग्रेस की ताकत का सबूत है कि सेन्टर में भी अपनी पार्टी और बहा भी अपनी पार्टी और तब भी वह मंजोरिटी रहते हुये भी इस्तीफा देते हैं, यह सिर्फ कांग्रेस पार्टी ही कर सकती है। शायद इन लोगो की पार्टी होती तो न करते। तब भी जिस समय बहा की कैबिनेट ने तय किया कि हम इस्तीफा देंगे, गवर्नर को सबमिट कर दें, तो माननीय चन्द्र भानु गुप्त और माननीय चरण सिंह आदि ने इन लोगो को परसुपड किया कि इस्तीफा मत दीजिये, बल्कि काम चलाइये, हम आप की मदद करेंगे। लेकिन

बहुत के धोग समझते थे कि पी० ए० सी० का रिजोल्ट मुमकिन है कि भासपास में फँसे उस सेक्टर की हुकूमत रद्दगी तो उन डोल करने में भासानी रहेगा ।

यू० पा० बहुत बड़ा प्रान्त है जिनमें 9 करोड़ का पोपुलेशन है और 55 जिले हैं । आधे से ज्यादा जिले इकानामिकली बैकवर्ड हैं, और डेड महीने बाद बारिश हुई जो कि 20 जून से होनी चाहिये थी वह 27 जुलाई स हुई । तो यह जिले ऐसे थे जहा बारिश नही हुई और इसमें पचास परसेंट पैडी एरिया है वह बिल्कुल खहम हो गया । वह 23 जिला का इलाका जो इकोनोमिकली बैकवर्ड था, डेड महीने मानसून न पहुचने की वजह से वहा फसल नही है और लागो में इतना दम नही है कि अपने पैरो पर खडे हो सके । इसलिये मेरा गृह मंत्री जी से अनुरोध है कि कोई कास्टीट्यूशनल ब्रेक डाउन नही था, आपके काम में कोई एकावट न पडे, एक मर्ज था वह फौलन न पाये इसलिये सेन्ट्रल क्ल वहा हुआ, अब उसे समाप्त करके पोपुलर गवर्नमेंट बहा बनानी चाहिये । क्योंकि मैं जानता हू कि तीन ऐडवाइजरर्स बहा रखे गये, जैसा कि मैंने पहले कहा कि 23 जिले इकनोमिकली बैकवर्ड है, देर से बारिश हुई उन 23 जिलो में से 12 जिलो को सूखाग्रस्त डिक्लेयर किया गया और यह इसलिये किया गया कि ज्यादा श्रद्धत न हो, यह अफसर परेशानी से बचना चाहते है, ज्यादा पब्लिक कमिटमेंट का काम नहा लेना चाहते, इसलिये 23 जिलो से से उन्होंने 12 जिलो को ही सूखाग्रस्त अनाउन्स किया । तो कहने का मतलब यह है कि अगर यह हालत चलती रही तो वह तीन ऐडवाइजरर्स के वस की बात नही है कि 23 जिलो में राजकाज कर सक, भुखमरी की हालत बहा हो चुकी है, इसलिये जल्दी से जल्दी लोकप्रिय सरकार की स्थापना की जाय जिससे उन विकट समस्याओं से निपटा जा सके ।

इन शब्दों के साथ जो स्टेटुटरी रिजोल्यूशन हमारे सामने हैं, उसका मैं समर्थन करता हू ।

श्री रामरतन शर्मा (बाँदा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उत्तर प्रदेश में राष्ट्रपति शासन घोषित किया गया । इसके पक्ष और विपक्ष में हुई बातों को मैंने बड़े ध्यान से सुना । मुझे इन बारे में कुछ नही कहना है, सबैधानिक बातें यहां पर तर्क होगी । मैंने कल माननीय के० डी० मालवीय, माननीय तारकेश्वर पाडे, माननीय रुद्र प्रताप सिंह और माननीय दिनेश सिंह की बातें सुनी । मुझे बहुत आश्चर्य है कि यह सब लोग उत्तर प्रदेश से आते हैं और दूसरे लोग भी जो उस प्रान्त से आते हैं और यहां पर बैठे हैं वे अच्छी तरह से इस बात को जानते हैं कि 1969 से, जब से श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी उत्तर प्रदेश में मुख्य मंत्री हुये तब से बहु गज्य से हम लोग पीडित हैं । और मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि सदन के बाहर कुछ कहा जाता है, लेकिन सदन के अन्दर कुछ और ही कहा जाता है, पता नहीं इनकी जबानी पर ताला क्यों लग जाता है, मुझे याद है माननीय मालवीय जी ने एक स्टेटमेंट दिया और उन्होंने कहा था कि मुख्य मंत्री को तुरन्त इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिये

SHRI K D MALAVIYA (Domoria-gan) May I have your permission to contradict the Statement?

SHRI R R SHARMA I stand corrected

अगर वह कहते हैं कि नही दिया है तो फिर प्रामुंसेट सेक मैं माने लेता हू । लेकिन इस सदन में बैठे हुये उत्तर प्रदेश के सभी ससद् सदस्य और उत्तर प्रदेश के जिले एम० एल० ए० है उनमें से तीन चौथाई लोगो ने श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी के खिलाफ बगावत कर दी थी ।

[Shdi R. R. Sharma]

पी० ए० सी० रिपोस्ट, बूख और सूखा कोई कारण नहीं है कि वहाँ पर राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करने का। कारण केवल एक है कि वहाँ पर अगर श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी कुछ दिन और रखे जाते तो कांग्रेस का पल्ला उलट जाता, इसलिये उनको कई बार दौड़ाया गया। और यह बात सत्य है कि श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी ने कहा था कि "मैं इस्तीफा देने को तैयार नहीं हूँ।" उनको यहाँ पर बार-बार दौड़ाया गया और झुका दिया गया कि तुम इस्तीफा दे दो वरना तुम्हारे खिलाफ बहुत बुरी कार्यवाही होगी। इस दबाव से उन्होंने इस्तीफा दिया है।

कांग्रेसी सदस्य कहते हैं कि वहाँ पर बड़ी अमनचैन थी। एक तरफ कहा जाता है कि श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी के प्रशासन में तमाम प्रदेश की प्रगति हुई हर प्रकार की उन्नति हुई है। फिर मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस्तीफा देने की क्या जरूरत थी? मैं आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश में पहले भी भूखभरी थी, अकाल था और बुंदेलखंड और पूर्वी जिले जो कि सूखे से पहले भी पीड़ित थे, पिछले साल और इस साल भी वहाँ पर मौते भूख से हुई है, और इस बात को शासन के सामने बार-बार लाया जाता रहा कि राष्ट्रपति शासन में भी कोई स्थिति बहुत अच्छी नहीं हो गयी है। मैं मंत्री जी से अनुरोध करूंगा कि उत्तर प्रदेश की तरफ ज्यादा ध्यान दें। राजनीति किस तरह से चलती है उस तरह से चलेगी, यहाँ के भाषणों का कोई बहुत बड़ा असर शासक दल पर पड़ने वाला नहीं है। लेकिन मैं उन से कहता हूँ जो उत्तर प्रदेश से आते हैं कि वे अपने हृदय पर हाथ रख कर सोचें कि क्या यह बात सही नहीं है कि तीन, चार साल से, जब से श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी का वहाँ शासन रहा, हम लोग अप्रत्याचार से दुखी रहे? और वही ब्यूरोक्रेसी आज भी वहाँ पर हावी है, उसी तरह से अप्रत्याचार भी पनप रहा है। कोई काम, कोई फाइल बिना लिये दिये नहीं चलती है।

सभी सदस्यों ने माना है कि कोई काम बगैर पैसे के नहीं हो सकता। इस तरह की अनिश्चितता में हम कब तक रह सकते हैं। मुझ को सूचना मिली है, मैंने अखबारों में पढ़ा है अभी आप की हिम्मत नहीं है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव कराया जा सके। मेरा यह दावा है कि अभी उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव नहीं कराया जा सकता क्योंकि अभी अभी कांफेडरियल रिपोर्ट, दो, तीन दिन पहले श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को भेजी गयी है जिस में कहा गया है कि अगर जल्दी उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव हो गये तो वहाँ पर सरकार बनाने का स्वप्न मिट्टी में मिल जायगा। मैं आप से आग्रह करता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति शासन तुरन्त और अविश्वस्य समाप्त करे और उत्तर प्रदेश में नये चुनाव कराये ताकि कोई पोपलुसर सरकार आ जाय और कांग्रेस का अप्रत्याचार अविश्वस्य समाप्त हो।

श्री नरेंद्र सिंह बिष्ट (अलमोड़ा) : आपने मुझे इस चर्चा में भाग लेने के लिए जो पांच मिनट का समय दिया है उसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ। सदन में उत्तर प्रदेश पर दो दिन से चर्चा चल रही है। मैं पिछले बीस साल तक निरन्तर उत्तर प्रदेश में या तो असैम्बली के मेंबर की हैमियत से या डिप्टी मिनिस्टर या मिनिस्टर की हैसियत से रहा हूँ। इस वास्ते मुझे बहुत अनुभव पिछले बीस साल में वहाँ के हालात का हो चुका है। मैं वहाँ की दस करोड़ जनता के हित की बात कहूँगा। सरकार वहाँ की कही जाए मुझे इससे कोई वास्ता नहीं है। मैं आपका ध्यान दस करोड़ जनता की ओर दिखाना चाहता हूँ जोकि पंद्रह बीस साल से निरन्तर पिछड़ती जा रही है भले ही आप उत्तर प्रदेश की पर कपिटा इनकम को देखें, एग्रिकल्चर को देखें, इंडस्ट्रीज को देखें इलीक्ट्रिसिटी को देखें, सूखा को देखें बाढ़ को देखें, कीमती को बढ़ती को देखें, चीजों की कमी को देखें, बेरोजगारी को देखें। वहाँ की इकोनॉमिक तथा सामाजिक हालात या कितनी भी

हलात को देखें अंग्रेज के जाने से ले कर अब तक के इतिहास को देखें आपको पता चलेगा कि वह पिछडनी ही गई है । उसका मूल कारण यही रहा है कि वहा कोई स्टेबल गवर्नमेन्ट अब तक नहीं बन सकी है । इसका एक कारण तो बहुत दूर तक यह नहीं हो सकता है कि उत्तर प्रदेश एक विशाल प्रदेश है, दस करोड़ की अबादी को सम्भाले कैसे । यह भूलने की बात नहीं है कि पूज्य पत जी जिस तरह से उत्तर प्रदेश की व्यवस्था को सुचारु रूप से चला रहे थे उनके बाद जितने भी वहाँ चीफ मिनिस्टर हुए चाहे डा० सम्पूर्णानन्द जी हो श्रीमती मुञ्जता ब्रजालानी हो, गुला जी हो, चरण सिंह जी हो, टी०एन० सिंह हो या कमलापति जी त्रिपाठी हो, इन मन्त्रों के कार्यकाल को आप देखें तो यही आपको दिखाई देगा कि वाजर की कोठरी में कैसी ही लागी गयी, एक रेख वाजर की लागी है पै लागी है । कोई भी हो उस पर कोई न कोई लाछन लगते रहे कोई न कोई टोका टिप्पणी उसकी होती रही । फलस्वरूप पन्द्रह सोलह सालो में उत्तर प्रदेश की बहुत बुरी हलात हो गई । यह बहुत गम्भीर विषय है और गम्भीरता से इसको हल किया जाना चाहिये । वहा की दम करोड़ जनता को अघकार में छोड़ देना और यह कह देना कि राष्ट्रपति का शासन हम लागू करते है काफी नहीं है । मैं नहीं समझता हू कि उत्तर प्रदेश का यह सही हल हो सकता है । वहा बहुमत की सरकार थी । उनके साथ 272 एम० एल० ए० थे । कोई कारण नहीं था कि सरकार उसी इम तरह से जाती । लेकिन सुनने में आता है कि इसके और भी कई कारण थे । एत मूल इका कारण पी०ए०भी०होगा लेकिन उसने असावा कई अभिचार के मिनिस्टरो के ऊपर घूसखोरी के आरोप भी थे और कई किस्य की बचायें थी । मैं आप से जानना चाहता हू कि अगर यह सही है कि सरकार को चाहिये वह इसकी पूरी पूरी जांच कराए और जनता उससे क्यों

सफर करे, कुछ पालिटिशियन के लिए, कुछ उन आदमियों के लिए जो आपस में अपनी ही भाई गे लगे रहे उनके हितों की रक्षा करने के लिए वग की दम करोड़ जनता हमेशा के लिए क्यों बरबाद होती जाए , यह एक बहुत ही गम्भीर प्रश्न है इसलिए भी कि 1/6 हिस्सा मारे हिन्दुस्तान का उत्तर प्रदेश है उत्तर प्रदेश हिन्दुस्तान का हृदय है और अगर वह बिगडता है तो सारी स्टेट्स पर उनका असर पडता है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह समय ऐसा नहीं है कि हम एक दूसरे की टीका टिप्पणी करे या दोषारोपण करे जैसे प्रपोजीशन ने किया है । उसने कहा है कि कांग्रेस में यह दोष है वह दोष है । मैं चाहता हू कि वह अपने दोषों को भी देखें । प्रेमीडेंस रूल के बाद अभी अभी सारी विरोधी पार्टियों के नेता लखनऊ से जमा हुए वे सब मिलना चाहते थे आपस में ? लेकिन वहाँ उनका मेल नहीं हो रहा सका । इर वान्त वाग्रस की टीका टिप्पणी करे और छिटाकणी करे कांग्रेस पर इससे कुछ भी मिलन वाला नहीं है कोई भी समस्या हल होने वाली नहीं है । बहुत ही आपत्तिजनक घटना उत्तर प्रदेश में घटी । अंग्रेज हिन्दुस्तान से गया इमलिट्टरी गया था कि हमने हिन्दुस्तान का आजाद करो का नारा लगाया था बल्कि इमनिग गया कि यहा की फौज में रिबोल्ट कर दिया था । इमका देवते हुए उसको भागना पडा । इसी तरह से उत्तर प्रदेश में पी०ए०सी०ने रिबोल्ट कर दिया था । जब रक्षक ही भ्रम होन लगे जब ला एड आर्डर की स्थिति की खराब होने लगे तो इसे को कोई मामूली घटना नहीं कहा जा सकता है । इमवा ततीजा यह हुआ कि प्रसीडेंट्स रूल वहा लागू किया गया जिसका मैं हृदय से समर्थन करता हू ।

मैं साथ साथ यह भी कहना चाहता हू कि यह समय ऐसा नहीं है कि हम खाली यही



[श्री नरेंद्र सिंह बि०ऽऽ]

सोचें कि हम किस तरह से सीटें जीतें कैसे हमारी हकूमत वहां बने हम लोगों को भ्रपनाएं इन छोटी छोटी बातों को उनको बता कर बल्कि इन से ऊपर उठा कर वहां की दस करोड़ जनता जो बेकसूर है इतने अरसे से दुखी चली आ रही है उसके दुख दर्द दूर करने की कोशिश करे उसकी हालत सुधारने की कोशिश करें ।

मैं पर्वतीय क्षेत्र से आता हू । मैं दो दिन से यहां पर जो चर्चा चल रही है उसको सुनता रहा हूँ । उत्तर प्रदेश के सब जिलों की चर्चा हुई लेकिन जो आठ पर्वतीय जिले हैं, जो बहुत ही पिछड़े हुए हैं उनकी कोई चर्चा नहीं की गई है । गेहूं में जिन तरह से घुन पिम जाता है बैसे ही उत्तर प्रदेश के सब जिलों में पर्वतीय प्रदेश भी पिस गया है । सबसे पिछड़ा हुआ पर्वतीय प्रदेश है । पर कपिता मे वह सब जिलों से पिछड़ा हुआ है । यही उसकी हालत दूसरे मामलों में भी है । उसकी तरक्की हो इस तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया गया है । श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की कुछ कृपा दृष्टि उधर गई है जिसके लिए मैं उनको धन्यवाद देता हूँ । एक सैल बना है प्लानिंग कमीशन में वहां के लिए । एक कारपोरेशन भी बनी है । श्री पनो, लीएम०पी० बहा कारपोरेशन के चेयरमन थे । उनको डिसमिस कर दिया गया और बइज्जत करके निकाल दिया गया । श्री कम नापति त्रिपाठी स्वयं हिल डिवनपमेट बोर्ड के चेयरमन बन गये । यह वह भी ले गए हैं वह भी नहीं रहे है । उममें कोई काम नहीं हो रहा है और न ही कारपोरेशन में कोई काम हो रहा है । वहा कोई विकास का काम नहीं हो रहा है । मैं दीक्षित जी से हाथ जोड़ कर प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि प्रेजीडेंट्स क्ल में कम से कम उस इलाके की और विशेष ध्यान देने की वह छुःगा करे । आजकल वहां खाने को कुछ नहीं है । कीमते ज्यादा होने के कारण यहां लोग दुखी है वहां तो और भी ज्यादा परेशानी है । वहां बरोड़गायी भी भयंकर

रूप में है । मैं आपका ध्यान आठ पर्वतीय जिलों की ओर आकर्षित करता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वहां जो हाहाकार मची हुई है अन्न का संकट है उन सब संकटों की ओर आप विशेष ध्यान दें और उनके निराकरण के उपाय करें ।

**श्री सरजू पांडे (गाजीपुर) :** यह दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण है कि हमें उत्तर प्रदेश में राष्ट्रपति शासन जो लागू हुआ है उसको मंजूरी देने के लिए बहस करनी पड़ रही है । उत्तर प्रदेश में आज भी एक पार्टी की मैजोरिटी है । पहले इन्वैक्शन मे कहा गया था स्वयं प्रधान मन्त्री ने कहा था कि एक पार्टी की सरकार बनाता कि काम ठीक से चल सके स्वायत्त या सके । उत्तर प्रदेश में एक पार्टी की सरकार बनी । यह उसका राजनीतिक दिवालियापन है कि आज भी उस पार्टी की मैजोरिटी होते हुए भी उसकी सरकार चल नहीं सकी उसको त्यागपत्र देना पड़ा । मुख्य मन्त्री अगर दोशी थे और और उनको हटा दिया गया तो दूसरी सरकार बनाई जा सकती थी । मुख्य मन्त्री के बारे में मुझ कुछ नहीं कहना है । सारा प्रान्त जानना है उनके व्यक्तिगत आचरण के बारे में, उनके कामों के बारे में । यहां भी उसकी बहुत ज्यादा चर्चा हो चुकी है । मैं समझता हूँ कि जिन नीतियों को आपने जनता के सामने रखा उनका यह दिवालियापन ही है कि आपको उत्तर प्रदेश में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करना पड़ा । मैं चाहता हूँ कि जितनी जल्दी हो सके, वहां एक सरकार का आप निर्माण करें । आपने अपने इलैक्शन मेनिफेस्टो में भी कहा था कि हम स्थायी सरकार लोगों को देंगे । उसको आप स्थापित करें । ऐसी सरकार का निर्माण आवश्यक है ।

जहा तक गल्ले के व्यापार को सरकारी हाथ में लेने का सम्बन्ध है, मैं समझता हू कि पूरे देश में सबसे कम गल्ला उत्तर प्रदेश में बसूल हुआ है। इसका कारण यह है कि कांग्रेस के लोग स्वयं तो गल्ला वे नहीं रहे हैं और जो वेते हैं उनका खुले आम विरोध करते हैं। बड़े बड़े कांग्रेसी हैं, विधायक हैं, एम० पी० हैं जिनके पास अनाज काफी है लेकिन सरकार को वे अनाज नहीं दे रहे हैं। आज भी वहाँ जब की आड़िनस बना हुआ है अनाज देने के लिए वे अनाज दे नहीं रहे हैं और नही अनाज बसूल किया जा रहा है और तरह तरह से वे इस काम में बाधा पहुंचाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं। कांग्रेस पार्टी की मीटिंग में सुना गया है कि कहा गया है कि जो कांग्रेसी गल्ला नहीं देगे उनको पार्टी से निकाल दिया जाएगा। बहुत सी फिजूल की बातें कांग्रेस करती है। कुछ निर्णय भी लेती है लेकिन उन पर अमल नहीं होता है। देश में खाद्य समस्या को हल करने के लिए वहा पापुलर गवर्नमेंट बने जो सख्ती से गल्ला बसूली का काम करे और लैबी लगाई जाए ताकि खाने को अनाज मिल सके। हमारे प्रदेश में लोग भूख मर रहे हैं। बाधा उत्तर प्रदेश बाढों से परेशान है। जहा तक पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश का सम्बन्ध है वहा लोगों को अनाज बिल्कुल नहीं मिल रहा है किसी भी कीमत पर और वे भूख मर रहे हैं। अनाज वहा बाजार में नहीं है। इस और आपका विशेष ध्यान जाना चाहिये।

अब मैं लैंड रिफार्म्स के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हू। इसकी बहुत चर्चा होती है। यहा भी होती है और बाहर भी होती है, कि देश में जो भूमिहीन है उनको जमीन मिलेगी। उनको जमीन मिलना तो दूर रहा, उनकी जमीनें भी छीनी जा रही है। जगह जगह पर सरकारी जमीनों पर, गांव सभाओं की जमीनों पर तमाम शरारती और बदमाश लोग कब्जा किए बैठे हैं। सरकार एक भी आदमी को निकाल नहीं सकती है। हमने तीन एडवाइजर मुकर्रर कर दिये हैं। सारी

असेम्बली के लोग बैठे हुए हैं। उनको तनख्वाह दी जा रही है। लेकिन तीन आदमी जो सबसे रहीं और निकम्मे हैं उनको एडवाइजर बना दिया गया है। हम लोगों के पत्रों का वे उत्तर तक नहीं देते हैं। मैंने खुद पत्र लिखे और प्रदेश की स्थिति से अवगत कराया लेकिन वे ज्ञान प्रकाश और लाल आदि बैठे हुए हैं, यह लिमूति बैठे हुए हैं, महोदय महादेव बैठे हुए हैं जो न बोलने हैं और न सुनते हैं। ब्यूरोक्रेसी वहां बहुत जुनूम कर रही है। मैं एक मिसाल देता हू। लखीमपुर खीरी में सम्पूर्णानन्द नगर के थानेदार के खिलाफ प्रदर्शन हुआ जो लगातार तीन साल से भ्रष्टाचार कर रहे हैं। उस थानेदार ने 42 आदमियों को गिरफ्तार करके जेल में डाल दिया, उनको मारा पीटा और उन पर आरोप यह लगाया कि वे पुलिस को भडका रहे थे। इतना बड़ा झूठ दुनिया के किसी काने में हो नहीं सकता है। हम होम सैक्रेटरी से मिले। उन्होंने स्वयं कहा कि मैं मानना हू कि गलत आरोप लगाया गया है। आज भी वे बन्द पड़े हैं। हर तरह की आजादी नौकरशाही के जरिये वहा छीन ली गई है मैं चाहता हू कि डेमोक्रेटिक इस्टीट्यूशन को आप मेटेन करे और पापुलर गवर्नमेंट वहा बनाए और अगर ऐसा नहीं हो सकता है तो कम से कम परामर्शदात्री समिति बनाए जो ब्यूरोक्रेसी पर रोक लगा सके, मुनाफा-खोरी को रोक सके, पुलिस के जो अत्याचार हो रहे हैं, उनको रोक सके। यह ब्यूरोक्रेसी सबसे बड़ा प्रेत है। आप कोई कानून बनाते हैं उस पर अमल ही नहीं होता है।

पी० ए० सी० के बारे में एक बात चाहता हू। उनकी जो मांगें थी सही मांगें थी, उनकी एसोसिएशन भी बननी चाहिये थी। लखनऊ विश्वविद्यालय के कुछ बदमाश लड़कों के साथ मिल कर पी० ए० सी० के लोगों ने विश्वविद्यालय में पेट्रोल डालकर आग लगाई और नारा लगाया, "मांभा अपन जिन्दाबाद।" इस तरह पी० ए० सी० के लोगों ने प्रति-

## [श्री सरजू पांडे]

क्रियावादियों के साथ मिल कर एक गलत भूमिका भ्रदा की। पी० ए० सी० और लखनऊ विश्वविद्यालय के कुछ बदमाश लड़के युनाइटेड हो गये और प्रतिक्रियावादियों ने उन को हवा दी।

लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में सारा दोष हम सरकार का है। पुलिस वालों की जो दुर्दशा हमारे देश में है, वह दुनिया के किसी देश में नहीं है। लेकिन इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि इस सरकार के बुरे और रूढ़ी कारनामों की वजह से उन प्रतिक्रियावादी शक्तियों को आगे बढ़ने का मौका दिया जाये, जो देश में दमन चलाना चाहते हैं, जो यहाँ डिक्टेटरशिप कायम करना चाहते हैं। आज ऐसे लोग आगे बढ़ते चले जा रहे हैं।

इसलिए मेरी अपील है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में पापुलर गवर्नमेंट बनाई जाये और पापुलर पार्लिसीज को इम्प्लीमेंट कराने की कोशिश की जाये। मुझे आशा है कि मन्त्री महोदय इस पर ध्यान देंगे।

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have heard practically all the speakers patiently... (*Interruptions*). I expect that the Houses, the Members opposite, in particular, will listen to me patiently in respect of the various points which have been raised in this House. A large number of hon. Members have spoken, and they have made quite a number of points. I wish to confine my remarks mostly to the important and salient points which have been raised by the leading Members of the Opposition.

Sir, except for a brief—I do not say so brief—initial, early period, when the House got bogged into a kind of unnecessary wrangle, the level of the debate had been of a high standard.

One important point has emerged out of the entire discussion so far as the State of Uttar Pradesh is concerned, as it is strictly relevant to the proposition before the House, namely, to approve the proclamation made by the President under the provisions of article 356 of the Constitution. On this proclamation, I can say—I hope without any serious opposition—that there has been no opposition to that proposition.

Other points have been raised. It has been pointed out that there were difficulties; that progress in Uttar Pradesh was slow; that development was not good; that the Congress party did not function well and things of that sort. But I do not think anybody has made a point that in the circumstances that arose, constitutionally there was any alternative to the action which the Governor took and which the President took ultimately. (*Interruptions*). Even in respect of the last speaker and of several other Members who appeared to be criticising, the substance of their speeches was that they did not oppose, particularly at this stage, the proclamation that the President has issued.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Very wrong. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: I know some Opposition Members are opposed to it. I do not doubt that. But what I am saying is that by and large that consensus has emerged from the speeches. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Jyotirmay Bosu will give me this opportunity to explain my points.

One more central point that has emerged, of a positive, constructive character, is that there is virtually a consensus, not only a consensus but almost unanimity, on the fact that the State of Uttar Pradesh has not received that measure of assistance and help in the matter of creating the *infra-structure* necessary for its economic development. My hon.

friend, Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, said that; Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu also said that, Members on both sides, virtually all of them, who have taken care to understand the situation, have confirmed this.

I believe that the lesson of this consensus of opinion will not be lost on the Planning Commission and the Finance Ministry of the Government of India. There is a reason for it. I want to be believed on this point. U.P. is well known for its liberalism. The officers coming from U.P. have been greatly in demand for their impartiality. They have been somewhat self-diffident. They have been feeling that they should rather put down their State than be called partial to U.P. That is why you find in economic matters U.P. has not received a fair deal; I confess it has unfortunately received a raw deal. I believe this long discussion that has taken place will have served a great public purpose if it is realised that a large State with 9 crores of population, with men known for their integrity, impartiality and capacity to work should be given a better treatment economically so that they can build their *infra-structure* and make better progress in the industrial and agricultural sectors.

I will give some figures which Mr. Bosu is not aware of. So far as electric power is concerned, I find that while the average per capita of electric power for the entire country was 94, it was only 59 in U.P. with the present installed capacity on 31st March, 1973.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Kindly explain it more fully as a teacher does.

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** You may call me a teacher, but I do not want to call you pupil. Even the estimated installed capacity per capita as on 31st March, 1974 would be 62 in U.P. as against 128 in the whole of India.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Allahabad):** Are they units or what?

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** What unit of electricity is he talking about?

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** I am giving the per capita electric power in U.P. as compared to the whole country.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur):** Per capita political power?

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** Not political power. I am talking of electric power. The per capita political power also has been deteriorating because of this situation.

The net installed capacity by the end of the Fifth Plan would be 112 for U.P. as against 192 for the rest of India, provided the provision in the Fifth Plan is increased by Rs. 140 crores. As at present, even that position would not be reached. On behalf of my State I feel grateful that the important point of industrial and economic under development in that State has been mentioned by most members, especially those of the opposition.

श्री राम देव सिंह (महाराजगंज) :  
प्रसिडन्ट रूल का श्रीचिन्त्य क्या है, यह तो  
बतलाइये ।

श्री उमाशंकर दीक्षित जिन बातों को  
श्राप उचित समझते हैं, उनको मैं भी उचित  
समझ कर उत्तर दे रहा हूँ । केवल गानियों  
का जवाब गानियों से नहीं दूंगा, बाकी सब चीजों  
के उत्तर दे रहा हूँ ।

श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु . हम लोग भी चन्दा  
उठा कर कुछ रुपया भेज देंगे ।

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:**  
In that connection, I want the ear of

[Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit]

the House. I want to point out that only an advocate who has no case or a poor case on merits will resort to abuse or will resort to the kind of expressions which one of the leaders of one of the parties used in the context of the Governor of a State of India. It is a well-known fact that so long as you have strong facts with which you can refute, you will not go down to abusing the opponent; you will not stoop to that level.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who has done it?

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: If you see that records, you will know who has done it. All that I can say is that I totally disagree with his facts.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Which Governor are you talking of?

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: Well, I do not think it will enhance the prestige of the House if I answer the kind of questions which the hon. Member has been asking.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It is better you keep your mouth shut too.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: I will first take up a few points, not all of which necessarily are major points, which Shri Bosu raised. Because, in most of these cases his facts were contrary to the known truths. So far as the policemen are concerned, he referred to the special fund or welfare fund of Rs. 2.75 lakhs. After this point was brought to the notice of the Government, before the trouble arose, Government had agreed to raise the fund from Rs. 2.75 lakhs to Rs. 12.75 lakhs.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Before the rebellion it was Rs. 2.75 lakhs.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: He referred to partial facts, part truths, half-truths, quarter truths and

three-quarter truths while speaking in this House instead of referring to basic truths where he cannot be attacked.

Referring to the drought-prone areas, he made fun of the exceedingly small amount that is said to have been set apart and utilized for this purpose. He said that a sum of Rs. 35 lakhs was set aside and, if I heard him aright, he said that only Rs. 23.53 lakhs had been spent. I have got the facts with me and I can say without fear of contradiction that during the two years when the Congress Ministry headed by Shri Kamalpathi Tripathi was in office, the sum allotted was Rs. 4.02 crores and the amount utilized was Rs. 5.09 crores. Here again our friend used a very partial fact. May be initially he got this figure somewhere, goodness knows where, and he has mentioned it in this context. It is travesty of truth.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, on a point of order. I picked up this figure from a publication of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. I can lay it on the Table in two minutes. It is lying outside.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: If all those papers the hon. Members has been referring to are laid on the Table of the House it would not be worth going there. I will tell you how in point after point he has referred to falsehoods. He referred to the backward districts and procurement. He knows next to nothing about districts, the procurement was not being done because we were afraid, because the officers were afraid of rich people and so on. The facts of the matter are these. Firstly, there are seven hill districts. They are deficit districts. There is question of procuring anything from there. There are 23 districts of which eight districts are marginal districts and the others are known deficit districts. You, certainly, cannot pre-

cure anything from there. Where there is hardly anything produced, where there is drought or scarcity, you don't want to procure. To some extent, the procurement was made from those districts also. When the officers found that it was not possible to distribute foodgrains adequately, in a certain number of districts—I do not know the exact number—they relaxed inter-district movement. By that method, they saved the situation. I think, this is a matter of which there should be appreciation of the work they have done.

Apart from that—I am referring to procurement—in the remaining 17 districts, nothing has been done to stop procurement. Only because of heavy rains, *khaffis* have been closed. The people do not bring foodgrains as they used to do formerly. A lot of other people have promised a raise in the prices. A number of things happened. But the officers, the Government of Uttar Pradesh .

श्री सरजू पाण्डे : य सारी बातें गलत कह रहे हैं। अफसरों ने गेह प्रोन्नयन कर के बेचा है। उन्होंने 78 रुपये में खरीदा और बिक्री के हाथ 105 रुपये और 110 रुपये में बेचा है—मैं साबिन कर सकता हू।

श्री उमाशंकर दीक्षित : अगर आप साबिन कर सकते हैं तो ऐसे अफसरों को ऐसी जगह पहुंचाया जायेगा, जहाँ उनको इधरना चाहिए। और नहीं कर सकेंगे तो उन को क्षमा प्रार्थना करनी होगी। मैं जिम्मेदारी लेता हू।

I will take the responsibility that if the hon. Member is able to prove a case where an officer has acted in the manner suggested by him, namely; he purchased at a low level and made a personal profit, and I promise in this House with full responsibility of the Government of India, that I shall see to it that adequate action is taken to prosecute the officer con-

cerned.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** On a point of order, Sir. Mr. Dikshit just now said that I have said something which is untrue. I have quoted from the publication designed and produced by the Planning Commission, by the Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity, the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, printed at the Indraprastha Press, New Delhi. This is the publication. I can throw it on the bin; I will not throw it at you. Come to p. 35, "Progress of Drought-prone Areas"...

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** He has started another speech. I am not going to yield. Let the hon. Member send me the papers and I will explain to him. There are many pamphlets printed. Unless he reads them all, no purpose will be served.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** I am on a point of order, Sir. Will you ask the gentleman to sit down? He has already mentioned my name and said that I have said something which is untrue, that I have lied before the House. This is a very serious charge. (Interruptions).

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** I have said, he has quoted correctly but the effect of it is untrue.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** The Chapter is "Drought-prone Areas"... (Interruptions).

**SHRI KARTIK ORAON (Lohardaga):** What is the date of the publication of the pamphlet?

15.00 hrs.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Progress of drought prone areas... (Interruptions). I am on a point of order. You have to give me protection...

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Order please. A point of order was raised. The Minister has yielded, he has sat down to listen to him. I do not understand why the members on that

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

side should disturb him. Let him finish his point of order.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have given the name of the publisher, the author, the printing press, etc...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes; you have already done that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Drought Prone Area Programme: Progress of Drought Prone Areas, Table No. V, Page 35; it says that for 1970-71, the amount allocated for Uttar Pradesh was Rs. 35 lakhs and the expenditure incurred, Rs. 23.33 lakhs. For 1971-72, it says that the amount allocated for Uttar Pradesh was Rs. 239 lakhs and the amount spent, Rs. 136 lakhs.

Mr. Dikshit, if you want you can have this book. (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: He is throwing like this! There must be a limit to everything.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Are we to tolerate this kind of behaviour? (*Interruptions*).

श्री डी० सोहनलाल (करोलबाग) ।  
अगर आज इनसे याफ्री नही मंगवाई गई  
तो हम भी इनके मुंह पर कोई चीज फेंक सकते  
हैं ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please. I am not concerned with who has spoken the truth, who has not spoken the truth. That is before the House. But, I think, this is a very indecorous and very objectionable behaviour on the part of a member to be throwing a paper like that. He could have handed over the paper to me...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: For examination. I take a strong objection to the behaviour of this Member.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: He called me a liar. He should withdraw that... (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please. I am already seized of the point of order. The point of order here is the proper behaviour of a member in the House. I have said that I take strong objection to this kind of behaviour. Now I leave it to the House what they want to do about it.

SHRI B. P. MAURYA (Hapur): He should be asked to apologise to the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: May I make a submission? You do not take notice when the Minister calls me a liar.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is a different matter. I can attend to that... (*Interruptions*) Order, please. I am now concerned with the behaviour of a member here. That is a different matter; we shall come to that; whether the Minister called Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu a liar or not, I do not know. (*Interruptions*) Order, please. I do not know. This has to be gone into. As far as I heard, I did not hear the word 'liar' being used. There may be a difference of opinion, but I am seized with the matter of the proper behaviour of a member in this House. If you think that the ends of the debate in this House and the ends of this House would be met, by just a mere expression of disapproval from me, the matter ends there. I leave it to the House.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: Now, only one other point...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think we should dispose of that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What about the other ends? He called me a liar.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI** (Chirayinkil): He never said it.

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** Sir, I respect your opinion and your ruling. But really the matter is... (*Interruptions*) Whether the gentleman does the right thing or not, that is his business. But, so far as we are concerned, I am willing to accept this proposition and to treat that part of the matter closed with your decision or ruling. Let me proceed.

Now, he said that the communal situation has deteriorated in recent years. I have gone into those relevant figures and I have found that that again is not correct. I am not saying that anybody has lied or anybody has done anything deliberately wrong. I am only telling you that this also is not correct. I have collected the figures. During the year 1970-71, there were 521 communal incidents. During 1971-72, there were 321 incidents. During 1972-73, there were 240 incidents of a communal character. Now, therefore, if these figures are correct and I claim that these figures are correct, then, it is not correct to say that during that period the communal situation deteriorated gravely as the hon. Member in question has said. Even that is not also really relevant. The relevant thing is the action taken in regard to the imposition of the President's rule and what happened afterwards. But so far as our friend to whom I just referred is concerned, he made these main points and I have referred to them and replied to them to the best of my ability.

Mr. Banerjee made a very interesting speech with quite a part of which I find myself in complete agreement. He referred to the PAC incident, because he belongs to Kanpur and he knows what happened in Kanpur, Lucknow and in other parts of U.P. Whichever Party he may belong to, he has the interests of the State at heart. What did he say? He says:

“पा० ए० सा० को भड़काया गया । जहर भड़काया गया । यह उनके शब्द हैं । मेरे शब्द नहीं हैं । भड़काया गया । यह शलत है कि पा० ए० सी० ने ठीक नहीं किया, लेकिन ऐसा कोई शलती नहीं हुई कि उन पर गोली चलाई गई ।” यह उन्होंने कहा साराण जहा तक पा० ए० सा० का सम्बन्ध है” ।

I am raising this issue....

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE.** Do you agree with that?

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** I may tell you—you can draw your own conclusions—*I speak loud enough and in a language clear enough that anybody can understand.* Now my friend will easily understand what I am going to say. A responsible member of this House, belonging to the Opposition, has said that the PAC was instigated. The only difference that my friend—I hope he will allow me to call my friend—

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE** (Kanpur): One thing he was forgetting. They had genuine grouses.

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** I will deal with those grouses and how we have dealt with them and how we are dealing with them now. Our friend, Mr. Madhu Limaye objected to my mere mention of a former Chief Minister of Bihar going to U.P. He particularly objected to that.

Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu objected to that. I mentioned that he was a former head constable, not to lower him, because I said that he was a respected person, well-known leader of the State. Therefore, I showed my respect for him. I mentioned that fact because being a former head constable he could have known their difficulties and had been taking interest in the subject. And what Mr. Limaye said did not weaken my argument. It strengthens it. Mr. Madhu Limaye said, what is wrong with it..



श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा ब्यवस्था का सवाल है। मैंने यह कहा कि पी० ए० सी० की जो सही मांगें हैं उनको प्रोत्साहन देने में कोई शकलही नहीं है, और मैं हजार दफ कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम सही मांगों का समर्थन करेंगे।

श्री उमाशंकर दीक्षित : हजार दफे उन्हें जो करना हो वह करे, लेकिन उन्होंने यह कहा कि : "घाट इज रांग विद इट। इस में क्या खराबी हुई।" आज भी वह कह रहे हैं कि अब भी सर्पाट कर रहे हैं और आगे भी करेंगे।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं अब भी करता हूँ।

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** The point is quite evident. This statement, Sir, is quite enough for the argument that I am making for your appreciation, that is to say, it establishes in the mouths of two responsible members of the House that the PAC in UP was instigated. Now, my friend said, it was supported, it was encouraged, was still being supported. Now, Sir, the position is this.

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE** (Howrah): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, instigation has a special political meaning. To support one's demand does not mean instigation. Instigation has a particular motive. What you are saying is in order to justify your actions there.

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** Earlier it was instigating, afterwards, it was encouraging.

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE:** That is the meaning which you were trying to give.

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** Actually, Sir. I don't want to hurt

anybody's feelings. I consulted the dictionary. It gives the meaning as, to urge on, to set on, to foment, and one or two other similar words are there. I have seen several similar words. It is not necessarily either an unparliamentary or defamatory or any such undesirable expression.

श्री मधु लिमये : अंग्रेजी इस्तेमाल करना कोई जरूरी है? काल्स फीम्ट्स कहते हैं।

श्री उमाशंकर दीक्षित : नहीं जरूरी है। लेकिन जो मैं कह रहा हूँ उस को छुपा करके सुने।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप बढ़िया हिन्दी बोलते हैं इसलिये हिन्दी में बोलिये। गलत बातें क्यों कह रहे हैं।

श्री उमाशंकर दीक्षित : जरूर बालता हूँ, आप सुन लीजिये।

Sir, the point is whether the situation was serious or not. I will not give too many instances. One hon. friend gave an illustration. It was the particular incident where one of these PAC men who had lost his head, due to this kind of instigation or encouragement, whichever way you like to put it, had taken away illegally two bags of wheat into his house and when a sub-inspector asked him to produce them, the bags were produced. Then the sub-inspector was gheraoed, he was taken round the streets with many other members of the PAC walking along with him, and that sort of thing happened. Now, Sir, regarding what happened in Lucknow, I will refer to the main incidents that will prove my point.

In Lucknow, the army was called in and it arrived at about 8 O'clock in the morning.

Sir, the P.A.C. men, who were guarding the University, at that time, failed to protect. In some cases they actually participated with the unruly elements—students and others—who had entered there. The university was burnt and Rs. 30 to 40 lakhs worth of property was burnt and important records were destroyed. The police people stood outside. Ignition material was given; petrol was given; rags were provided. This happened in Lucknow. What happened in Kanpur? It was felt that some serious action should be taken after holding detailed discussions and consultation with the Centre. When the army people approached the 14th Battalion, they could have agreed to surrender, as it happened elsewhere. Sir, on the contrary, here the first fire came from the P.A.C. Unless something sudden, something undesirable or some indoctrination had taken place to the effect that this was something good or something patriotic, it would never have happened. They fired the first shots and a few army jawans fell. Of course they too returned the fire. Unfortunately, some casualties took place elsewhere also. In Jahangirabad some four or five officers were taken as hostage and the PAC people held out there. They would not allow anybody to enter place.

Finally, the Inspector General went there and the men were persuaded to surrender. The facts are known—they were reported in the Press—and what I want to point out now is this. Firstly, the signs of dissatisfaction among the P.A.C. came to light late. Unfortunately two things had happened. I must admit. One is that the L.I.U.—Local Intelligence Units—were affected. Whoever planned it, they planned it exceedingly well with the result that nobody else knew what was happening. (*Interruptions*). I am saying this after ascertaining the facts. The leaders were from the L.I.U. A large number of members were from the L.I.U. They kept this matter developing—

brewing. The higher officers know nothing about it. That is one fact to be noted. Secondly, the Chief Minister, his advisers, his Cabinet and his officers must thought: "The P.A.C. have some genuine complaints and grievances. Let us consider and settle their grievances." They met the leaders and negotiations were held. Their main demand was for an association for representing their grievances. The Chief Minister agreed to have an association for the PAC and started it under the Police Forces Restriction of Rights Act. They refused to join it. They said that they had started their own Parishad, a separate association, where only constables and head constables would be represented. Finally, shortly before the trouble broke out, this demand also was granted. In fact this gave them a wrong impression. But, so far as their main point was concerned, they wanted a representative machinery of their own for bringing up their difficulties to the higher authorities. And that demand was granted. Only they were asked to have the draft of its constitution amended in accordance with the provisions of the said Act, as otherwise it would have been illegal. Thus every reasonable care was taken in the beginning to meet the legitimate grievances. For instance, there was increase in the Amenities Fund from Rs. 275 lakhs to about Rs. 12.75 lakhs; then, grant of civil dress allowance to LIU, CID and SD, and grant of actual DA instead of a fixed allowance of Rs. 10 per month.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan):  
What was the justification for imposing President's rule in UP? He has not said anything about that. That is the main point.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:  
The justification was the trouble over the PAC. That is the main point and I am dealing with that. Then, the minimum duty period for food

[Shri Uma Shankar Dixshit]

allowance which was formerly 18 hours in writing—although not fully enforced—was in writing reduced to 9 hours. There were other facilities also given but since hon. Members are getting impatient and they do not want me to enter into all those details, I do not want to do so. But I want to give this assurance that whatever their complaints or requests could be accepted immediately, they were accepted immediately. Their central demand for an association was first met by starting an association according to the law. When that was not accepted, they finally told their head representative, one Mr. Roy, 'Well, you can have your own association, provided you amend the provisions of its constitution according to the Act'. But he did not do so; on the other hand, his sympathy was utilised as an evidence of weakness. People rushed from there all over the State, and more members of the Parishad were enrolled. The idea was that they should hold the armoury and hold the arms with themselves, and no matter what happened, they should be able to have their way. What actually was in their minds, God alone knows or those who were in association with them might know. As for us, we can only imagine. But we need not imagine beyond the fact, to which I am drawing your attention here, namely that the situation that had occurred was not of a minor dimension; it was a very serious situation

In a State, it is not the traffic police that keeps order or ensures the security. It is not the district civil police who keep security and law and order. It is the PAC, the armed constabulary that does so, and in different situations it is their services that are demanded. The U.P. Government had come to the conclusion that the idea of the PAC, was not to settle their grievances, but something beyond that. The Chief Minister, in consultation with the Central Gov-

ernment then decided to take certain adequate measures. He felt confident that he would be able to deal with the situation. He was able to deal with the situation for a certain time. But matters went beyond the States jurisdiction. Originally, he did not think that it was anything more than a mere accumulation of grievances, and he thought if Government showed a reasonable attitude he would be able to solve the problem. But when he found that that was not so and he got information from other States, when he found that in another State also, in Madhya Pradesh, there was some such talk going on, he had second thoughts. You may condemn him, you may condemn us. But let me say this, and it is due to him in all truth and all conscience that he himself declared that we should examine all possible alternatives. These were his words and not mine. He suggested that we should examine all possible alternatives and then decide what we should do about the situation. He saw that what happened in one State might happen in another State or two. If it really spread, then the Army should have to be sent to other places also. That was the situation. Therefore, the Chief Minister took some time. He had two or three meetings in Delhi and then he went back to Lucknow and held discussions with his senior colleagues and with his Cabinet. Then, finally, when everybody agreed, he came to the final conclusion. Whatever may be his merits and demerits; we, most of us, have got our demerits also. But what you cannot say about him is that he can be driven to accept something which he does not want to accept. He may have taken it up as a national task; he may have considered that it was good for the country. He is a patriot whatever else he may or may not be. People have said certain things about him which really do not behove this House. Somebody used a very bad word about

him. Personally, I do not know a more clean person than Shri Kamla-pathi Tripathi. In administration, he may have made mistakes. We all make mistakes and the Opposition who had joined hands in coalition in U.P. made mistakes. Nobody can say that he cannot make mistakes. But personal integrity is something different. Things have been said which should never have been said. Sometimes things happen in such a way that you are not able to correct them. It was he who had second thoughts that matters had gone beyond his ken. I must also admit that the Government of India also thought that it was a serious situation, so much so that even supposing Shri Kamla-pathi Tripathi, or whoever might have been the Chief Minister had thought that he could just carry on, and set things right, even so, we wanted that there should be an all-India approach according to which the situation should be judged. I want to tell you this frankly that so long as I am in this Ministry, I shall not want these forces, the security forces, the law and order forces, to be politicalised.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** It is a trade union matter.

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** This is not a trade union matter. This is my opinion. The point is that they should not be reduced to a party-political level, because once party politics enter, we know what happens. I know what has happened in various public and private sector undertakings. I shed tears when I see wonderful public sector undertakings being spoiled by a multiplicity of unions. We are a democracy. Do not expect us to act like dictators. We consult and we try to go as far as we can together with the other people. They may talk whatever they may like. But no action has been taken where in serious matters either the Cabinet or the Opposition has not been taken into confidence. You may not agree with me entirely. But the point I am making is that a very

serious situation had occurred in which the State leadership and the Central leadership agreed that the matter had gone beyond the State and a pattern had to be evolved and certain action had to be taken so that when normalcy was restored, they could go back to the previous position.

It is said that this has been done due to party faction, that we are trying to take party advantage out of this situation. I have been thinking about it. I want to know how and I am willing to carry on correspondence on the subject. I find that we are passing through a great disadvantage. What is the advantage we have derived out of it. The officers often do not care for representatives. Those of the opposition who have been in office in Kerala, in UP and Madhya Pradesh know that it makes a world of difference between being in office and out of it. And when you deliberately do that, they say that it is for a party advantage. Our own people are dissatisfied. Our own people tell us every day: please finish this business quickly.

We have our own views about officers. Not all of them are bad, not all of them are good. I hold no brief for them. But this has been done out of a compulsion. It became inevitable.

Now about the Governor. Because he does not dress like an overlord or like an Englishman or like some of our new Congressmen, therefore, does he become less of a Governor? He is one of the most decent men I have come in contact with. As you know, he belongs to Hyderabad. When you go to him, he would act like a *durwan*. He will open the door for you and ask you in. That only shows his sense of courtesy and decorum. That does not make him a *durwan*. That only raises him in our estimation, as a man of dignity, as a man of self-respect, as a man of the old traditions. He is keeping those traditions. For that you want to call him

(Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit)

a *darwan*? Is that the way you want to treat such a dignity? Tomorrow, the day after or the day following the hon. member himself becomes a Governor. Who knows—though I do not think it will happen so soon.

So far as the Opposition is concerned, every responsible Opposition thinks that at some time or other it will be called upon to take up responsibility. Of course, some party may think that that will never happen and therefore they may take up a wholly English copy-book maxim attitude that the duty of the Opposition is to oppose. If we do a good work, they say: We oppose it because our duty is to oppose; therefore you must do bad work. If that is their line of action, I have nothing to say. (*Interruptions*). A responsible Opposition expects that sometime or the other it should have to take office. If you were in office, will you like the security forces, the law and order forces, to be politicised? (*Interruptions*). Kindly allow me I want to finish it quickly. (*Interruptions*) Sir what I submit to you is this: that in that situation that developed, we wanted a pattern to evolve which could be followed all over the country. If I understood my respected friend—I do not agree with all his views but I have said that I have my respect for the manner in which he presents his case and personally I should think I should speak like that—he said—

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Who?

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: Mr. Vajpayee. He said, "For goodness' sake do not have trade unions. You may have associations; you may have" he mentioned some other body "that, but do not have trade unions because once trade unions enter the police and the army, God save the country."

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why not?

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: Well, I do not know whether you want an ordered progress in this country or you want something else. That is for you to decide. But anyone who wants law and order in this country would like the security forces to be well preserved. In my opinion, President's rule has vindicated the decision. See the various activities that have taken place. See whether law and order has improved there or not. There has been considerable improvement in the Situation. Of course, the problem is that when there are members of the Assembly functioning some say, transfer a particular officer says 'do transfer' a particular officer and someone else says 'do not transfer him'; half of them are on one side and the half of them are on the other side. And this applies to all parties. I know something of what has happened in Madhya Pradesh and also what happened in West Bengal at one time.

AN HON MEMBER: Abolish democracy.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: I cannot abolish democracy. I am not a dictator. I am not a Moghul. If you have the powers, we would like to see how you or anybody else acts. This country is a country of individualists and they will not allow dictatorships to happen. Now, Sir, a full probe has been carried out and a pattern is being evolved according to which action can be taken. The Director-General of Border Security Forces has suggested lines of action to be taken. We are consulting the other States, and we hope to be able, within a short time, to evolve and adopt a pattern which will be suitable. If policemen feel that police superintendents should not represent them, a model can be devised. But if they begin to work like some trade unions are working, then disastrous consequences may happen. (*Interruptions*).

This is not the forum for talking party politics, but certain matters have been raised which I can only clear by saying a few relevant things in a few minutes. Our party is rather a broad party. (*Interruptions*) There are people who have come from—my friend Shri Shyamnandan Mishra is not here—we all belonged to the Syndicate Congress or the Congress (O), and from there we have come. Some other people wanted to join us. Why did they want to join us? You can say some of them who wanted a ticket—(*Interruptions*).

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** What is this? Is it all relevant?

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** It is relevant.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** We do not want to hear your inter-party differences here. (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** I do not want to tell you all that I only want to tell you this: you or anybody else should not be misled by appearances. The President's rule—(*Interruptions*)

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** Sir, is it all relevant? Please see the rule of relevancy. (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** It has been said that it was a party faction and to remove the party faction this has been done. I am telling you why it is not so.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** That is enough.

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** You may not insist, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, but other friends have insisted upon it I will not take long (*Interruptions*). Why have people joined us? They were communists, they were socialists; there were in PSP who have joined the Congress. Some of them have told me personal-

ly we believed in certain programmes but we could not, we are not in a position to implement those programmes, you are implementing those programmes. As recently as a month ago, a well-known socialist of political and intellectual integrity, Shri Prabhu Narain Singh joined our party with a large number of people. Why? There was no advantage. To say that it was all due to faction is not correct. (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये प्रिजिडेंट्स रूल के समर्थन में तर्क देने के बजाय मंत्री महोदय बता रहे हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी भटियारखाना है।

श्री उमाशंकर दीक्षित माननीय सदस्य जो कुछ कहना चाहते हैं, वह खुशी से कहें। लेकिन वह कृपा कर के मेरी बात सुन लें।

It seems to hurt and that is why you are shouting. You have given; you should take also. Even after the President's rule differences continued to be aired in newspapers. The High Command raised their voice and the party obeyed instantly. Differences are still there among us; we are trying to come near each other. Because there are members who have some what different views; we are trying to come together and therefore we express ourselves. No faction has been resolved by these changes and no factions can be resolved in that way.

It has been said by Mr. Madhu Limaye."

'संविधान की हत्या कर दी गई, उस का गला चोट दिया गया।'

These are the words he used. What does he mean? He merely means that President's rule had been imposed. Vajpayegi said that as far as he could think the framers of the Constitution did not visualise a situation such as this. My simple reply is this. It is impossible for human ingenuity, skill, and in-

[Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit]

believe to imagine all possibilities. It was the profound skill and wisdom and foresight of the founding fathers of the Constitution that they have formed article 356 in a phraseology which will serve any situation.... (Interruptions). What happened when Shri Rajagopalachari was the Governor-General of India.

SHRI HAMENDRA SINGH BANERA (Bhilwara): The Prime Minister is the only person who has understood the logic of article 356; 22 times she has used it.

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: In Punjab on 20-6-1965, the Congress Party was there. Dr. Gopichand Bhargava was the Chief Minister and the Congress Party had 70 members in a house of 77; they resigned and the Governor had to recommend President's rule. Rajaji was there at that time. I do not think there was a more skilled politician or logician than Rajaji. What happened in Kerala? There was the coalition Ministry under Achuta Menon in January March 1970; in the Assembly session the Ministry received a vote of confidence. On 20-6-70 the Chief Minister advised the Governor to dissolve the Assembly and he tendered the resignation of the Council of Ministers. Therefore the Governor had to recommend the imposition of President's rule. What happened in Orissa? A coalition of Ganatantra Parishad and Congress was there in a house of 140. The Congress Party leader tendered the resignation and decided not to form an alternative ministry; the coalition partner was also a party to this decision. Therefore, President's rule had to be imposed. This has not happened for the first time. It shows the Constitution of India is a semi-federal Constitution. The States were not independent....

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA (Arambagh): Please explain it. Is it according to Harold Laski?

SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT: I read it about 20 years ago. It is too old for the present literature.

As I said, these are not new things. If the Constitution is such that it provides for one particular situation only, how many articles will you have in it? It is the duty of the framers of the Constitution to frame articles to cover not only known situations but even unimaginable situations. There is nothing wrong in it. Mr. Sezhyan was good enough to admit that it was according to the letter of the Constitution, but not according to the spirit. Which spirit? Where is that spirit? After all, the spirit is in the language. The point is, after what had happened, whether it was possible for the administration in UP to be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the constitution. Most of you will agree that this was not possible. Therefore, in the circumstances, there was no alternative except to have President's rule.

Some members asked, "why not dissolve the Assembly? When are you holding the elections etc." Members who have general information are aware that the delimitation of constituencies is being carried on. Nobody knows how long it will take. Now, what is the particular advantage in dissolving the Assembly now and holding the elections after six months? By keeping the Assembly in suspended animation, the Governor in fact gave an opportunity to the opposition, if they so wished, to go to the Governor and stake their claim. Mr. Vikal, who is now a member of our party, went and saw the Governor in U.P. in 1968 and staked his claim. Nothing prevented Shri C. B. Gupta or Shri Charan

Singh to see the Governor, and say, "Here are the people who support us". Then the President's rule would have ended. They did not do so because they would not have lasted a day. Mr. Charan Singh and Mr. C. B Gupta are seasoned politicians; they would not do something just because somebody wants them to do so.

When we have President's rule, it is for a period of six months. I can say that it will be for six months. We will not have it, unless you permit us, for more than six months.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** When is the election?

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** Ask the Chief Election Commissioner.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** I am asking the Home Minister who dictates to the Chief Election Commissioner.

**SHRI UMA SHANKAR DIKSHIT:** I do not.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:** You are running away from the election:

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** The question is:

"That this House approves the Proclamation issued by the President on the 13th June, 1973 under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh."

*The motion was adopted.*

15.45 hrs.

**RE. CERTAIN REMARKS MADE BY  
A MEMBER ABOUT DR. RAM  
MANOHAR LOHIA**

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Before we take up the next item in the

Order Paper, I would like to refer to certain unfortunate references that were made yesterday to the late Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia and the point of order that arose from those references.

Before I come out with what I have to say on this matter I am not sure whether a ruling would be called for or not I would like to say that despite differences of certain sections of the people with the late Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, I think there was not any kind of disrespect to him in any quarter. He was original thinker, a very provocative person. Even when he opposes you, he provokes you to think; that is the greatness of the man. He was a patriot of the purest water. He was a man of conviction and do not think that anybody had any doubt about this. He was an honourable member of this House. I had the good fortune of being a member along with him when he was a member. I can speak from my personal experience that whenever he got up to speak, he made rich and valuable contributions to the proceedings of this House.

Now, in the heat of the moment, many of us find it difficult to restrain our language, and when there are sharp exchanges in the House it becomes very difficult. Yesterday I had that kind of difficulty when some members raised some objections. I thought they were referring to the proceedings of the previous day. That is an example of how difficult it is to find out what is going on when the House is in din and confusion.

I am sure that even Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, who made these references, did not mean any disrespect to Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. As a matter of fact, in his speech he has said this very clearly. I will quote from what he has said. He has said:

"We have great love for Dr. Lohia."