

Srinivasan, formerly of ICI, as Finance Director, have been approved. For HEC, Shri Chalapati Rao, at present General Manager, Chittaranjan Locomotives, has been appointed Chairman, and Shri S.S. Jagota, a Consultant to the Bureau of Public Enterprises, as Deputy Chairman. In MAMC, a new Managing Director Shri V.B.K. Murthy, was appointed a few months ago.

With the resignation of Shri K.M. George, Managing Director, Bokaro Steel Limited, the work was being carried on by a Committee of Management. We have appointed Shri Mantosh Sondhi, at present General Manager, Heavy Vehicles Factory, Avadi, to this important post.

With regard to HEC and MAMC it is quite true there is the problem of idle capacity or of surplus capacity after a certain date. I would like to inform the House we have taken two important steps in this direction. One is to decide to form a cell in the Ministry which would look to all the other Ministries and public sector undertakings and while the main responsibility for procuring orders would rest with HEC and MAMC we in the Ministry would also help them in the best way possible to procure these orders. I hope with these steps we shall be able to give them the orders in the years to come.

Sir, while I had various other points, in view of the very loud objection of Shri Srikantan Nair, who is not here— Sir, I feel tempted to ask for another five minutes but I think that would be presuming upon the patience of the House— I would like to thank you for the courtesy you have extended to me in giving me an extra five minutes.

16.05 hrs.

THE COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FORTY-EIGHTH REPORT

श्री रामाबतार शास्त्री (पटना): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि यह सभा गैर-सरकारी सदस्यों के विधेयकों तथा संकल्पों सम्बन्धी समिति के 48वें प्रतिवेदन से, जो 23 अप्रैल, 1969 को सभा में पेश किया गया था, सहमत है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is :

“That this House do agree with the Forty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd April, 1969.”

The motion was adopted.

16.05½ hrs.

RESOLUTION RE : POWERS AND FUNCTIONS OF GOVERNORS—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House will now take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi on the 28th March, 1969:-

“In view of the recent controversy regarding the powers and functions of the Governors, and in the context of smooth Centre-State relations, this House is of opinion that a Committee of 30 Members of Parliament be constituted to consider the necessary amendments in the Constitution of India.”

We have exhausted not only two hours but we have exceeded it by five minutes. Usually we do not extend the time because if we do several other Members are precluded from moving their resolutions. Therefore, I am going to call the hon. Minister.

SHRI PARTHASARATHY: (Rajampet) Sir, a motion is going to be moved for extension of time, because it is a very important Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I can extend it only by half an hour, and that I have done.

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore): Could I make a submission ? So far as your observations regarding wanting to follow the rules are concerned, they cannot be challenged by anybody. I do not think anybody wants to violate the rule or the ruling you have given. I am only making an appeal to the House. We have to make a distinction between important and unimportant subjects that come up for consideration before the House. As the opposition parties well know, the subject of Centre-State

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

relations has assumed such importance that every Chief Minister is concerned with, and interested in it. Similarly, in Parliament many hon. Members, including those belonging to the Communist Party, want a re-definition of Centre-State relations in terms of the real powers of the Governor, financial allocation etc. This House has to apply its mind methodically and earnestly to the current problem. Therefore, if the House so desires, I suggest that we may extend the time.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I have a submission to make. This particular Resolution, if you kindly read it, says:

"In view of the recent controversy regarding the powers and functions of the Governors, and in the context of smooth Centre-State relations,..."

Whether it is a question of the powers of the Governor being properly used or misused or the Centre-State relationship. We have discussed them in this House during the Demands for Grants of the Home Ministry, no-confidence motion and other discussions. It has also become so delicate that it should not be discussed any more in this House. So, it is better that the Home Minister replies to the discussion and the other resolution regarding the appointment of a commission to go into the charges against the Birla group of concerns, which is an important one, is taken up.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : I hope he takes this stand always.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have already said that we are following a certain procedure in this House. In the Committee usually the maximum time that is allotted for a Private Members' Resolution is two hours. If a particular matter is extraordinarily important, it is for the Member concerned to approach the government to get additional time. My powers are limited. I can extend it only by half an hour. Therefore, I am now calling the Minister and then the mover of the Resolution to reply. Then I will go to the next Resolution.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central) : May I make submission?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If it is about this Resolution, "No". My ruling is final.

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE: Sir, I am not challenging your ruling. Nor am I making submission regarding your ruling. I bow to your ruling. It cannot be challenged; it ought to be respected. I have only one very small and short request. So far as this Resolution, which is before the House, is concerned, you have expressed your limitations. You have extended the time also. But I hope you will grant me permission to request the government to extend the time and I am sure Government will accede to that request.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Unfortunately, that is not the procedure. At this hour, government has no say in the matter. So far as these two and a half hours are concerned, only the House can decide it. If the House unanimously had come to a decision that the matter is very important and the time should be extended, I would have certainly liked to respect the plea made by my hon. friend, Shri Hanumanthaiya.

So far as I am concerned and the practice that we have been following in this House is concerned, it would be not be in keeping with our practice. We should not try to encroach upon the Private Members time in this manner. There are other Resolutions also. I am not concerned with the content of the Resolution at all. I am concerned with certain practice and procedure that we follow here. We must respect them. The Minister is to reply. (*Interruption*) If it is unanimous, I would have considered it. I cannot do it. So far as the time factor is concerned, I am not prepared to listen to any plea from any quarter.

Otherwise, I would have very much liked to accept what Shri Hanumanthaiya said. The hon. Minister.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K.S. RAMASWAMY): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the hon. Members who took part in the debate almost unanimously welcomed the Resolution moved by Shrimati Sushila Roha'gi.

The Centre-State relationship has assumed great importance after the General Elections in 1967. Our Constitution, of course, is a quasi-federal one.

It is no wonder that as in several other federations, here too we got Centre-State

relationship coming up for discussion quite often. The framers of the Constitution did not want a unitary form of Government in this country because of the vastness, the size, the great population and the backwardness of the country. Taking all this into consideration, the Constituent Assembly observed as follows : "The soundest framework for our Constitution is a federation with strong Centre." So, the Constitution of the country is a federation.

After Independence, we had one-party rule at the Centre as well as in many of the States and even then there were several occasions when the Centre and the States did not see eye to eye. There were many problems. The relationship, of course, was not strained and yet there were differences of opinion in the planning Commission as well as in the National Development Council and in other places. The different voices were made by different parties and the States had their own problems which the Centre could not satisfy. They always clamour and demand for more and more funds and other things. Now, when there are several parties with different ideologies and different programmes ruling in several States, it is no wonder that this relationship is a bit strained. But we have got enough provisions in the Constitution by which we can always solve this problem.

The biggest against the Centre is that the States should have more financial powers. So far as the plan expenditure is concerned, the N.D.C. is there. They have got their full say in the Plan discussion. That matter is discussed, there. The Finance Commission which is a very impartial body is going into this question everytime and up to this day there is not any single dissent against the decision of the finance Commission. The Finance Commission is a very impartial body and they look into this matter. In this respect also they need have no fear.

There is also a statutory body to settle the inter-State river water disputes. The Zonal Council is there to also solve the differences between several States. If only the several parties can co-operate to see that the relations are maintained, if only they give up their political point of view and really want the Constitution, I am sure that these things can be settled, even if there genuine difficulties, by negotiation, by having conventions,

by framing rules and all that. I am sure, the various political parties ruling in different States will realise this, and if they do, then any crisis can be averted. As a matter of fact, there is no Constitutional crisis as such, but we have got differences. We are working the constitution. We are a young independent country. So, there are bound to be differences but, in due course, they will all be settled. If only we are serious in working the Constitution and preserving the unity of the country and a strong Centre I am definite that any crisis can be averted.

Because of the differences between the Centre and the States after last General Elections, the question of the powers of Governor has come up often. Some hon. members opposed the institution of Governorship, but there were also others who welcomed it. Especially at this juncture when several parties are ruling in different States, the institution of Governorship has assumed some importance. It is a very good link between the Centre and the States. The only question is about the use of the discretionary power by the Governor. Of course, there have been some instances in the past where differences of opinion existed between the parties. But the Government is sure that the Governors, on different occasions, have taken stands taking into consideration all the circumstances prevailing then.

If there is really any difference, in any crisis, then the parties and the leaders can meet together and try to establish some more conventions and frame rules for the guidance of the Governor.

There was a demand for setting up an Inter-State Council under article 263 of the Constitution. At present we do not feel the necessity for such a Council to be set up. The Prime Minister has already said in the Rajya Sabha that there is no necessity now. But the Administrative Reforms Commission ..

SHRI HANUMANTHAIYA : May I make a suggestion to the Minister ? The Minister need not take the trouble announcing the decisions because the Administrative Reforms Commission has been entrusted with the work of making a report on Centre-State relationship. If he says anything in advance against the establishment of the Inter-State Council, that will be foreclosing

[Shri Hanumanthaiya]

the issue. I would very much wish that the hon. Minister does not commit the Government to any position in view of the fact that this very subject is being examined by the Administrative Reforms Commission and that will be the next report that the Commission will be giving.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : I was about to say that. I only quoted... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : Here is a conflict of view. Therefore, the Chairman of the Administrative Reforms Commission should have been allowed to speak on this.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now unfortunately, he did not make use of that occasion when we debated the resolution. I am sure the Government has taken note of the valuable suggestions contained in the report. So the hon. Minister while replying may take note of it and keep in mind what Mr. Hanumanthaiya has suggested. It is for him to take a determined stand. That is for you to decide.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : I only quoted the Prime Minister's speech in the *Rajya Sabha*. I was about to say also that the Administrative Reforms Commission is going to submit a report on this issue and Government will take due note of it and come to a conclusion.

SHRI LOBO PRABHU (Udipi) : My suggestion is that you can find the subject of Governors in the context of the State because what we say is not strictly relevant to what has been said by the speakers. He is giving a lecture on his own on Centre-States relations. However good it is, it is not relevant.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY : This resolution is a timely one and I welcome it. But taking the circumstances into consideration, I request her to kindly withdraw it.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI (Bil-haur) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, at the very beginning I would like to convey my deep appreciation and gratitude to all the members of the various political parties here who have participated in the course of the debate here. For some time they forgot that they belonged to various political ideo-

logies and affiliations and they arose as one united member of the House and I must say that considerable heat was generated on one occasion when some hon. Member from the Left Communist Party raised it and he spoke in a very free and frank manner. But even then, I must say, when he was so excited, he kept within the limits of parliamentary decency and I would like to congratulate him and the other members of the Congress and the Opposition for working in a very fine manner. Not only as a member of the House but as a lady Member of the House I appreciate and I welcome this and I would call upon my friends and colleagues on both sides to maintain this standard in future also.

I think, Sir, in a democratic spirit we can agree and we can even agree to disagree. But in both these cases we can always agree to work in a high manner and in a manner which is conducive to the dignity of the entire House.

Now, secondly, I feel, and I had mentioned it right at the beginning, that this was a matter which would call for divergence in our views. There is a section in our House which feels that the powers given to the Governors are not sufficient and the powers of the Governors should be increased in order to meet the various complexities that are arising in our political problem to-day. There is a certain section which feels that this institution of Governors must go; it is a paraphernalia of the past; those days are gone and the red carpet must be rolled up as the days of the British regime are over. In spite of this divergence you will find that the House has given its free opinion and I must say that in the opinion expressed by all the Parties there is some substance and I hope that the Government takes up this matter and not side-track all these things but give attention individually to all the speeches made here and see what grain can be sifted which may be utilised in the national interest and leave out things which are not necessary at all.

I also mentioned in the beginning and I must admit it very honestly—that when I tabled the Resolution I was feeling some trepidation. I am not a constitutional lawyer or a constitutional pundit; but I said that there are occasions in life when one has to rise up to meet the challenges and I am sure,

with the amount of interest taken by Members here, and the great interest evinced by my hon. friends, as evidenced by the interest of many hon. Members who are wanting to speak today, my resolution has been a timely one, as was mentioned by even the opposition members today. I know there are certain limitations, and I do realise the same. Under the Rules of Procedure you cannot increase the time further. But I am most grateful to you that in the beginning you pointed out that it was an important Resolution and in deference to the wishes of the House you have been good enough to increase the time by thirty minutes. I am grateful to you for that.

Now we come to the burning question at issue. My purpose, right in the beginning, when tabling the Resolution was this, that the entire House should focus its attention on this burning problem of today. There are cases where we find the powers of the governors are not defined. The word 'pleasure of the Governor' is not defined. We go by the Nigerian constitution; but it is not defined here. The 'discretionary power' of the Governor is not defined. In discharge of the discretionary power when the Governor does something, he comes under fire and everytime he has to meet with the criticism of the House and the criticism of their own people in the various States. Whether it was Kerala or Rajasthan or West Bengal or Madhya Pradesh, in all the States, you find that when they prorogued the House or dissolved the House, when they exercised certain discretionary power, in individual cases the governor had to face the anger. Of course, the House has a right to get excited over certain matters; and people are vitally connected with the events there, in each individual State. The gravity of the situation was realised when the Resolution was originally taken up. That is, on 28th March when the Resolution was tabled it was quite fresh; it was quite new. But it had to be taken up again on 11th April, and it had to be taken up again today. I know today, there is a live fire hanging over the next resolution concerning the Birla concerns and I can very well appreciate the anxiety of the House and I can appreciate the impatience of the House. I can understand that. There is nothing which would excite them more than this.....

श्री मधु लिमये (मुर्गेर) : आपकी बात को हम बहुत गौर से सुन रहे हैं।

श्रीमती सुशीला रोहतगी : मुझे मालूम है, इसके लिये मैं आपकी बहुत आभारी हूँ।

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirappalli): We have the fear that somebody is trying to block that Resolution brought up for discussion. That is our fear.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : So far as fear part is concerned, there is only one fear and that is the fear of conscience. Politically I see no reason for any fear whatsoever. They may or may not agree with it but I can very well understand the anxiety of the House to skip over this resolution and immediately take up the Resolution which concerns the Birlas.

I would not like to elongate the matter any further, but I would only say that this subject of the Centre-State relations and the powers of the Governors, is a matter which just cannot be skipped over in two hours. I would suggest that this may be taken up at various levels, at State levels, administrative levels, political levels and to discuss with the people concerned all the aspects of it from every angle allowing free flow of ideas all round. I therefore, feel, and this is what I appealed to the Prime Minister in the very beginning that she should utilise the attendance of the Chief Ministers at the National Development Council; and I believe she must have done this on the 18th. But because of so many matters of urgent nature there, I think it would not have been possible to give the amount of time which was necessary for the purpose of the resolution here.

Therefore, I would suggest, in view of the important nature of the subject, the Prime Minister should call a meeting of the Chief Ministers from time to time—not only when any serious matter arises, but to cover the whole series of Centre-State relations in the context of the new environments, new leadership, emergence of new political forces, emergence of new ideologies in the States and the Centre. This should be a frequent occasion for bringing all the Chief Ministers together and discuss the matter with the

[Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi]

Home Minister and the Chief Ministers at various State levels.

I am sure that the Deputy Minister who has just now suggested that it would be a good idea if people from time to time could sit together and discuss this, would convene, if possible—if not a Committee of Parliament Members to suggest constitutional amendments—a Committee of the various members of Parties here whenever he thinks convenient so that we can formulate some guidelines for the Governors and define some of their powers which are bound to bring them into clash with some Parties. I would like to say one thing more.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN (Mettur) : We are convinced about your arguments and we will support you.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : Thank you. But I would like to take the House into confidence on a vital issue. For the last two years we have been facing the biggest stigma in our political life, and it is defection, not only in the Congress Party, but among all the Parties. I think that the House has become aware and the whole country has become aware that the mid-term elections which have come in-between have justified that the practice of defection does not pay either politically, or morally or ethically.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : Even now it is being indulged in.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : It is a vicious circle. I think a senior member like Prof. Ranga will agree that these things will not go in one day. It is something which is morally wrong and therefore, we have ourselves to rise above that. It is for the Members of Parliament to show the way.

SHRI DHIRESWAR KALITA (Gauhati) : On the other day Shri Chavan was asked whether he will agree that Congress Party will not indulge in any defection and he said he could not assure.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : I think it was a very frank and honest confession. I think the whole country must admit that it was a very good confession. How can anybody take upon himself the responsibility for a big Party consisting of lakhs and lakhs of people? Let us take any of you here,

AN HON. MEMBER : We can take up that responsibility.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : I can count you by the dozens. But take the case of a very big party. Anyway it is bad. And here I would ask for the co-operation of all the honourable Members. Just as you give that assurance from your side, I hope a stage will come when we also and other Parties also will be able to give an assurance of that type. I feel that the controversy about the exercise of Governors' powers has arisen because of defection. These defections have led to the instability of Governments and this has led to the question of majority or minority and Governors exercised their discretion whether it was constitutional as in the case of Rajasthan or due to lamentable lack of decency as in the case of Haryana. This has been going on from time to time. Therefore, I am not very much inclined to withdraw the Resolution because I really appreciate the genuineness of the support given by all the members of the Parties. But the House is divided on one issue. Some want more powers for the Governors while some others want absolute abolition of the posts of Governors. Personally I think that the Left Communist Party should be banned because that Party feels that the posts of Governors should be abolished. Democracy likes in coming to some compromise..... (Interruptions).

SHRI NAMBIAR : First Congress Party should be banned, and the beginning is in the burning of their AICC Pandal. God has shown the beginning.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You should not gloat over an incident of this nature. This is not proper.

SHRI NAMBIAR : This demand that Communist Party should be banned is raised every now and then as if it is their father's property. India is not the father's property of certain individuals... .. (Interruptions). We have a right to be here legally. The question of banning the Communist Party cannot be so lightly dealt with. We have a right to be here. We are the citizens of this country and nobody can say that the Communist Party can be banned so easily. Our conscience is pricked by that. We have got feelings and you have to understand that we want that the Congress party should be banned.

श्री रसबीर सिंह (रोहतक) : क्या पता श्री नम्बियार के चेलों ने इसको कर दिया हो।

कैसे यह कहा जाता है कि खुदा ने यह कर दिया है ?

श्री मधु स्तिमये : हंसी मजाक में कहा है। गम्भीरता से नहीं कहा है।

SHRI NAMBIAR : This is not the first time that we are hearing this.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Nambiar, I just cautioned you, because an accident of this nature, whether it occurs in the Congress Party *pandal* or in the Communist Party *pandal*, should not be referred in such a manner that you take delight in that.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : I am afraid you will have to hear me saying that the Communist Party must be banned so long as I am here in this House. I am prepared to concede that what Mr. Nambiar said was only a joke and he never meant it seriously. I will also go to the extent of saying that it is a great thing to hear the word 'God' from Mr. Nambiar and his partymen. That shows they and their party have a soul, they have a conscience and they pray to God. I congratulate him on that. Because I referred to the banning of the Communist Party. I knew he got angry and even though he mentioned God in his anger or anguish or vehemence, still it is a good thing. I did not want to cast any aspersions on anyone. Since they have a conscience and a soul, let them see the houses that have been burnt in West Bengal where Naxalbari incidents have taken place. I never provoke anybody, but if I am provoked then I should be heard. The Communist Party has scholars and orators. Prof. Dange is one of the ablest Members of this House and of their Party. We see that his eloquence, his oratory and his scholarship are being utilised for disruptive purposes and not for the good of the nation as a whole. I would appeal to him to utilise his scholarship and background in strengthening the national solidarity, instead of in disruptive activities.

The second point is about the Governors.

SHRI S. KANDAPPAN : The Governor has taken the secondary place.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : That is because the Communist Party assumed the first place. It may not be possible for the Government to constitute a Committee when there is so much conflict of opinion. On the one side there is the demand for increasing the powers of the Governors and on the other the demand for the abolition of the institution of Governor. I would request the hon. Minister not to bypass the sentiments of the Members here. He should be appreciative of the feelings of the entire House. I would appeal to him to have a Select Committee so that these matters can be discussed at all levels.

I believe the Administrative Reforms Commission, I think it is a Study Team, has suggested that under Article 164 a new enactment should be done and the powers of the Governor should be increased.

But we find that the Administrative Reforms Commission has been seized of the matters concerned with the powers and functions of Governors. Its report has not yet been published. I hope before Government come to any conclusions when they take up the matter with the various Chief Ministers concerned, they will also consult the report of the ARC. I also hope the views of every individual member who has spoken will also be taken into account.

As regards the amendments, I do not understand the view expressed by Shri Shinkre. He is a very learned and quiet hon. member of the House. Members should be vocal when they speak in the House, but when I say 'quiet', I mean in the sense of not making noises and other disturbances in the House. Such members should be given special consideration while participating in proceedings. He wants to add after 'Parliament', the words 'representing all the States and Union Territories'. How can this be possible? That will make it a hotch potch. I do appreciate the idea behind amendment, but it will defeat and nullify the very purpose of the Resolution.

Shri Samar Guha is not present here. All the same, I would like to deal with his amendment. I do not know how far he is really interested in the constitutional aspects

[Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi]

He is more a scholar, historian and poet. When we hear him speak on Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, waxing eloquent on his heroic deeds, we feel enhanced and thrilled.

With these words, I would again appeal to Government that they must take all these views into consideration. Since the House has been patient enough to give me these 15-20 minutes, I would now request it to pass on to the next Resolution on the agenda.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : So she is seeking leave of the House to withdraw her Resolution.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI : Yes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Has the hon. Member the leave of the House to withdraw her Resolution?

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : No, we do not give leave.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं विरोध करता हूँ ।

SHRI SHINKRE (Panjim) : I seek leave of the House to withdraw my amendment No. 1.

Amendment No. 1 was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I shall now put Shri Samar Guha's amendment No. 2 to vote.

Amendment No. 2 was put and negatived

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Since objection has been taken to withdrawal of the main Resolution I have to put it to vote.

श्री मधु लिमये : उन्होंने मांग भी नहीं की है ।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : She said it in the beginning.

The question is :

"In view of the recent controversy regarding the powers and functions of the Governors, and in the context of smooth Centre-State relations, this House is of opinion that a Committee of 30 Members of Parliament be constituted to consider the necessary amendments in the Constitution of India".

The Lok Sabha divided :

Division No. 15]

AYES

[16.48 hrs.

Abraham, Shri K. M.
Anbazhagan, Shri
Anirudhan, Shri K.
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy
*Basumatri, Shri
Bhagaban Das, Shri
Bramhanandji, Shri
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Deb, Shri D. N.
Deo, Shri P. K.
Esthose, Shri P. P.
Ghosh, Shri Ganesh
Gopalan, Shri P.
Halder, Shri K.
Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra
Jharkhande Rai, Shri
Kalita, Shri Dhireswar

Kameshwar Singh, Shri
Kandappan, Shri S.
Khan, Shri Latafat Ali
Limaye, Shri Madhu
Majhi, Shri Mahendra
Mangalathumadam, Shri
Meghachandra, Shri M.
Menon, Shri Vishwanatha
Misra, Shri Srinibas
Modak, Shri B. K.
Mohammad Ismail, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Naik, Shri R. V.
Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
Nambiar, Shri
Patil, Shri N. R.
Patodia, Shri D. N.
Ram Charan, Shri

Ramji Ram, Shri
 Randhir Singh, Shri
 Ranga, Shri
 Ray, Shri Rabi
 Satya Narain Singh, Shri
 Sen, Shri Deven
 Sharma, Shri Ram Avtar
 Sharma, Shri Yogendra
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar

Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh
 Shastri. Shri Sheopujan
 Shastri Shri, Shiv Kumar
 Sreedharan, Shri A.
 Tapuriah, Shri S. K.
 Viswanatham, Shri Tenneti
 Viswanathan, Shri G.
 Xavier, Shri S.

NOES

Achal Singh, Shri
 Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
 Ahmad, Dr. I.
 Ahmed, Shri F. A.
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata
 Besra, Shri S. C.
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhandare, Shri R. D.
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.
 Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Desai, Shri Morarji
 Deshmukh, Shri K. G.
 Dinesh, Singh, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G. C.
 Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
 Ering, Shri D.
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganga Devi, Shrimati
 Ghosh, Shri Parimal
 Gudadinni, Shri B. K.
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri

Hazarika, Shri J. N,
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Himatsingka, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri Tulshidas
 Jagjiwan Ram, Shri
 Jamna Lal, Shri
 Kamala Kumari, Kumari
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kedaria, Shri C. M.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Kushok Bakula, Shri
 Lalit Sen, Shri
 Laskar, Shri N. R.
 Lutfal Haque, Shri
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
 Marandi, Shri
 Master, Shri Bhola Nath
 Masuriya Din, Shri
 Mehta, Shri Asoka
 Mehta, Shri P. M.
 Melkote, Dr.
 Menon, Shri Govinda
 Minimata Agam Dass Guru, Shrimati
 Mishra, Shri G. S.
 Mohammad Yusuf, Shri
 Nahata, Shri Amrit
 Pandey, Shri K. N.
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Panigrabi, Shri Chintamani
 Pant, Shri K. C.

Paokai Haokip, Shri
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Partap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri
 Patil, Shri Deorao
 Patil, Shri S. B.
 Poonacha, Shri C. M.
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaffi
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri
 Raju Shri D. B.
 Ram Dhani Das, Shri
 Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Rana, Shri M. B.
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Saha, Dr. S. K.
 Saigal, Shri A. S.

Saleem, Shri M. Yunus
 Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethuraman, Shri N.
 Shah, Shri Shantilal
 Shambhu Nath Shri
 Sharma, Shri Madhoram
 Shinkre, Shri
 Sinha, Shri R. K.
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Sonar, Dr. A. G.
 Supakar, Shri Sradhakar
 Sursingh, Shri
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Verma, Shri Prem Chand
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
 Yadab, Shri N. P.
 Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The result* of the division is :

Ayes 53 ; Noes 102.

The motion was negatived.

16.50 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE : APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSION TO GO INTO CHARGES AGAINST BIRLA GROUP OF CONCERNS

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON (Ernakulam) : I move :

“Having regard to the seriousness of the charges that have been levelled against the Birla Group of concerns by very responsible persons including Members of Parliament, this House is of opinion that a High Power Commission should be appointed by the Government to go into those charges and recommend appropriate action.”

Sir, I move this resolution with the hope that the entire House will support the same because it has become a serious matter in this country and especially among great many Congress Members themselves. This question has roused them to a great extent. Many allegations have been raised and many have been proved. Many allegations have been raised by the Congress Members themselves. Mr. Chandra Shekhar, a Member of Parliament, and other Congress Members have come out openly.

For the past 22 years, this country was ruled by the Congress, and Mr. Birla, within such a short time, has built up his empire all over this country. Birla's influence in every walk of life is clearly established by various charges levelled by Mr. Chandra Shekhar. Within three years' time, from Rs. 200 crores, Birla's income has risen to Rs. 500 crores.

AN HON. MEMBER : Total assets.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON : Yes ; the total assets have risen to Rs. 500 crores.

The following member also recorded their Votes for NOES :
 Sarvashri Basumatari and Sitaram Kesri.