

[Shrimati Jyotsna Chanda]

The region I represent has been subjected to frequent influxes of displaced persons from the hell-fire of neighbouring East Pakistan. It is a matter of regret that a substantial section of old migrants remains to be properly rehabilitated while the entire population of new migrants (those who came in January to August 1964) are yet to be brought under any rehabilitation scheme. It needs no imagination to suggest that steps should be taken without any further loss of time to rehabilitate them. The agriculturists should be provided with land, if not individually, in state farms, while other categories should be absorbed in industries, preferably in the public sector.

I feel the Government of India should consider the question of freeing different industries from the impact of multiple taxation by the Centre and the States. I refer particularly to the tea industry which is at present tormented and troubled by multiple taxes from the Centre and the States such as the Agricultural Income Tax and other taxes by the State in addition to the Central Excise Duty, Income Tax etc. of the Government of India. My suggestion is that the Central Government alone should levy the Income tax and another duty on tea—obviously at an enhanced rate—and the States producing tea should get a proportionate share from the revenue realised by the Central Government on this account. This will not only minimise collection costs but will also save the industry from multiple troubles. Besides, the Central Government will get greater opportunity to regulate this industry which is one of our major foreign exchange earners.

An accelerated programmes for building roads and bridges is imperative for any developmental efforts. Improvement of the Barak waterway and of the neglected hill section of the Northeast Frontier Railway in my area is also called for, in addition

to taking up of the multi-purpose Barak Valley Project for flood control, hydro-electricity and navigation.

Before concluding, I deem it my duty to refer to the agriculture in our country. If our country is to be lifted out of the present morass and alarming stagnation, the actual tiller must be guaranteed security of tenure not only on paper but also in actual practice.

I support the Budget.

17-33 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. PROCLAMATION
REGARDING PRESIDENT'S RULE
IN KERALA

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): Sir, as Members are aware, at the mid-term elections held in Kerala on March 4, no party has been returned with an absolute majority or anything approaching it. In order to explore all avenues likely to lead to the formation of a stable Government, the Governor had been in touch with the various party leaders from March 8, and on March 16 he held detailed consultations with the leaders of Communist (Marxist) Party, Indian National Congress, Kerala Congress, Samyukta Socialist Party and the Muslim League. The Governor did not seek the views of the Right Communist Party of India as they had secured only three seats. The position that emerged from these consultations briefly was that although Shri Namboodiripad felt it possible for him to negotiate with the various groups and individual legislators and evolve the basis on which a non-Congress Government could be formed, the leaders of the Kerala Congress and the Muslim League made it clear to the Governor that they would not join or support any Ministry that might be formed or sponsored by the Communists. The attitude of the Congress was that it would act as

a "constitutional opposition" to whatever government might be formed, supporting it to the extent, its policies were in line with those of the Congress, but not otherwise. The leaders of the Samyukta Socialist Party, while desiring that the leader of the largest party should be called upon to form a government, said that they would not agree to be in a Ministry formed by the Communist (Marxist) Party and would function as an opposition, taking, however, a responsive attitude towards such a Ministry. Thus, except for Samyukta Socialist Party who were not opposed to a Ministry formed or sponsored by the Communist (Marxist) Party, the parties were clear that they would neither lend support to, nor seek the support of, that party in forming a government. In the circumstances, the Governor found no possibility of the Communist Party commanding a working majority even if those of their members who are in detention were free to function as Members of the Assembly. The Governor did not, therefore, call upon the leader of that party to form a government.

The Governor explored other possibilities too, but in view of the decision of the Congress Party not to join with any other party to form a Government, and the combined strength of the Kerala Congress, Muslim League, etc., being only 37, the Governor came to the conclusion that there was no possibility also of any other party being able to form in combination with other parties and groups Viable Ministry.

Accordingly, in his report dated March 18 to the President, the Governor stated that it was not possible for a representative Government to come into existence as a result of the recent elections to the State Assembly and recommended to the President the issue of a Proclamation under Article 356 of the Constitution.

After careful consideration of the Governor's report, the Vice President discharging the functions of the Pre-

sident has this morning revoked the existing Proclamation in respect of Kerala and issued a fresh Proclamation assuming to the President all functions of the Government of Kerala and all powers vested in or exercisable by the Governor of that State.

Sir, I place on the Table of the House a copy of the two Proclamations issued by the Vice President discharging the functions of the President and an Order issued by him in pursuance of sub clause (i) of clause (c) of the new Proclamation. I also lay on the Table a summary of the Governor's report to the President. [Placed in Library]. See No. LT-4065/65].

श्री मधु लिमये : (मुंगेर) आप की अनुमति हो तो मैं व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ ।

संविधान की जो विभिन्न धारार्ये हैं उन के अन्तर्गत यह व्यवस्था का प्रश्न आता है । मैं आप का ध्यान संविधान की धारा 163, 164, 172, 174, 175, 176 और 356 की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ । मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि आज तक पांच छः दफा राष्ट्रपति की हुकूमत हमारे देश में कायम की गई है । पंजु में की गई है, पंजाब में की गई है और चार पांच दफा केरल में की गई है । लेकिन यह चीज पहली दफा देखने में आरही है कि एक बार विधान सभा का चुनाव हो जाने के बाद तुरन्त विधान सभा को ही समाप्त किया जा रहा है, उस के काम को ही स्थगित किया जा रहा है, उस को कोई मौका ही नहीं दिया जा रहा है लोकतांत्रिक ढंग से हुकूमत बनाने का । मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि विधान में वे जो विभिन्न धारार्ये हैं उन की इस से हस्या होती है । इसलिए मैं आप की मार्फत सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह विधान सभा की बैठक को बुलावे और उस को पूरा मौका दे लोकतांत्रिक ढंग से हुकूमत बनाने का अगर विधान सभा उस में असफल होती है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि

[श्री मधु लिमये]

संविधान के अनुसार राष्ट्रपति की हकूमत कायम करना जायज होगा। लेकिन जब तक नई चुनी हुई विधान सभा का यह मौका नहीं दिया जाता है, तब तक मुझ ऐसा लगता है कि ये जो विभिन्न धारारों हैं, उन के अन्तर्गत राष्ट्रपति की हकूमत कायम करना ठीक नहीं होगा।

मैं आप से एक और प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ। अगर आप तुरन्त इस व्यवस्था के प्रश्न का फैसला नहीं दे सकते हैं क्योंकि कई धारारों हैं तो आप अपने फैसले को सुरक्षित रख और कोई ऐसा समय निर्धारित कर दें जब यह फैसला दिया जा सकता हो।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यही चीज है जो होम मिनिस्टर ने समझाने की कोशिश की है। आप ने 163 का जिक्र किया है। उस में तो यही है :

"There shall be a Council of Ministers with the Chief Minister at the head...."

दूसरे आप ने 164 का जिक्र किया है। उस में यह है कि :

"The Chief Minister shall be appointed by the Governor and the other Ministers shall be appointed by the Governor on the advice of the Chief Minister...."

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): May I draw your attention to article 174?

Mr. Speaker: Article 174 says that the Governor shall from time to time summon the House or each House of the Legislature of the State to meet at such time and place. Then there is the procedure how he has to do it.

The next article the hon. Member mentions is 172 which says that every Legislative Assembly of every State

unless sooner dissolved shall continue for five years from the date appointed.... I have seen this article also. The hon. Member mentions, next article 175 which says that the Governor may address the Legislative Assembly; and then to article 176, which says, 'At the commencement of the session....'

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: Without summoning the House, which is the constitutional duty or obligation of the Governor, how can the Governor decide to dissolve or prorogue the House?

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. House is aware, I cannot decide whether this action is *ultra vires* the Constitution or not. If any Member is aggrieved he can go to the Courts and decide it there. That would not be a point which shall be taken up by the Speaker for decision at the moment.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि क्या आप उन को इजाजत दे रहे हैं टेबल पर रखने की जब कि यह संविधान के खिलाफ है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : हाँ।

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): My name stands first, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I am not treating it as if it is in respect of those whose names are there. I will give them a chance.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): What I submit to you and to the House is that a very extraordinary situation has developed on account of what the Home Minister has just done. I say so because as a student of constitutional history and of law, it should be well-known to some of us anyhow that this whole question of proclamation as a substitute for parliamentary legislation had created

a great deal of controversy in the 17th century England and our constitutional articles in relation to President's rule have certain safeguards only in order to emphasise the rights of Parliament in this regard. Parliament is in session. A report has come from the Government of X State to the President and the President, advised I am sure by his worthy Ministers, has taken a decision which he is condescending to communicate to the House at a moment of time when we are sitting in this House to decide as to what should be done or should not be done in any part of our country. The Proclamation as set out by the President ejects the entire province of Parliament in this regard. The whole idea of the President's proclamation having to be placed on the Table of the House and receiving the sanction of the House even if retrospectively is a very important constitutional provision which implies by the very nature of it that it is in Parliament that this kind of rights vests and it is only when Parliament is not in session the President issues that proclamation and after that the proclamation comes before Parliament for retrospective sanction. Here, we have been confronted with an order of the President which changes the entire legislative picture of the country, while it is our job, as Members of Parliament to do something about it, not of the President with all respect to him or of the Home Minister as his principal adviser in regard to internal affairs.

Therefore, it is very unfair for the House to be confronted suddenly with this kind of thing; it is constitutionally most improper, I think, for the Government to communicate the decision of the President in a matter of this description. There is a very definite distinction in our constitutional law if we are going to go by the kind of precedent which we discuss in constitutional matters, a distinction between a proclamation by the President and legislation by Parliament and it is only because the President is driven

2562(A) LSD—10.

to a certain course of conduct that he issues this proclamation and these proclamations are always contingent upon the sanction of the House. When the House is in session, the President has no business whatever to issue a proclamation which would contravene the law of the land, which is the province of Parliament to change or not to change.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry I cannot agree with Shri H. N. Mukerjee, because, if you look into the provisions of article 356, there is no condition precedent that the Parliament should not be in session when the President has to make that proclamation. The only words used are:

"If the President, on receipt of a report from the Governor of a State or otherwise, is satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the government of the State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution.."

The subsequent provisions that this has to be laid before Parliament and then Parliament has to discuss it and whether ultimately it is extended or not or approves of it or not—all those things have to follow afterwards and not at this moment.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg to submit that there are—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have stated my opinion.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I would like you to please give your mind to this matter for one moment. The very fact that the President's proclamation issued during the recess of Parliament is placed before Parliament for sanction retrospectively is a fact from which a deduction could be made by any sensible constitutional lawyer that when Parliament is actually in session, the President cannot by a proclamation change the political structure of the country unless the President's recommendation, through

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

his Council of Ministers, comes before Parliament, is discussed and then the Parliament itself sends the resolution to the President to do that. I cannot, for the life of me, understand how we can function, when we are here in Parliament, the President issues a proclamation changing the life of our country. This is a kind of thing which reminds the people of the 17th century, when Dunning, in his resolution, said that the influence of the King has increased, is increasing and ought to be diminished. The powers of the President have increased, and they ought to be diminished. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He ought to resume his seat now.

Shri Badi: The hon. Minister has said that he would come to the House to make a statement on such and such a date. But suddenly, today, he has come and made a statement in respect of the President's proclamation. Of course, the Ministers must have recommended to the President, and on their recommendation, a proclamation has been issued. But when Parliament is in session, is it not a wrong precedent? Is it not allowing a bad precedent? There has already been an election, the parties have been elected. Why not call upon the parties to form a Government, and then, if they are not able to carry on the government, other steps might be taken. But, now, when Parliament is in session, a proclamation has been issued. Today, the Communists have come in a majority; the single largest party. Tomorrow it may be the Socialists or the Swatantra. (*Interruption*). So, the point of order is this, and that is what you have to decide: when Parliament is in session, whether the Government, behind the back of Parliament, can set aside the will of the people and Parliament, and issue such a proclamation.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक और व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले एक तो खत्म होने दीजिये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : वह तो आप ने कह दिया कि आप उसे मजूर नहीं कर रहे हैं । इसलिये अब मैं दूसरा प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ने अपनी बात कह दी ।

श्री पालीबाल (हिण्डौन) अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या इस पर आप डिस्कशन प्रलाऊ कर रहे हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कोई डिस्कशन प्रलाऊ नहीं कर रहा हूँ ।

पहली चीज तो मैं ने हाउस के सामने प्रार्थ कर दी है कि अगर माननीय सदस्य यह प्रार्थ कर रहे हैं कि यह कांस्टीट्यूशन के प्राविजन्स के खिलाफ है या नहीं, तो मैं यह बोल अपने सिर पर नहीं ले सकता । यह सुप्रीम कोर्ट का काम है । अगर कोई मे बर या कोई सिटिजन ऐग्रीव्ड महसूस करता है तो वह सुप्रीम कोर्ट के पास जा सकता है या हाई कोर्ट के पास जा सकता है । यह उन का काम है कि फैसला दें कि यह कांस्टीट्यूशनल प्राविजन्स के अनुसार है या उस के विरोध में है । इसलिये मैं ने यह कहा कि यह जिम्मेदारी मैं नहीं ले सकता और न कभी किसी स्पीकर ने कभी लिया है ।

दूसरा सवाल यह उठाया गया कि जब पार्लियामेंट मौजूद थी उस वक्त प्रेजिडेंट साहब को प्रोकलेशन करने का हक नहीं था । यह ऐतराज हम तब कर सकते हैं जब कोई प्राविजन्स इश्य करना हो । यह प्रोकलेशन डेफिनिट कांस्टीट्यूशनल प्राविजन 356 के नीचे उन को करना होता है । उसी के अनुसार उन्होंने ऐसा किया है । इस बारे में मुझे कोई ऐतराज इस में नजर नहीं आता कि इस को पार्लियामेंट के अन्दर आना चाहिये या

व्योंकि यह डिजिजन उन्हें लेना है अपने सर्जिकल सटिसफक्शन से। इस में हमें अपनी राय नहीं देनी है। यह नहीं है कि हम इस के मुतालिक राय दे और उस के अनुसार वह प्रोकलेमेशन करें या न करें। गवर्नर को रिपोर्ट करनी है और प्रेजिडेंट साहब को अपना सैटिसफक्शन देखना है। यह स्टेटमेंट दे दिया गया है। मेरे ह्यल में इस पर कोई ऐतराज नहीं हो सकता।

श्री मधु लिमये : अब मेरा दूसरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न आप सुन लीजिए।

कल ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव आया था। अगर कल मंत्री महोदय उस के ऊपर अपना वक्तव्य दे देते तो मेम्बरान को मौका मिल जाता प्रश्न पूछने का और अपनी बातें रखने का, और उस की रोशनी में, हो सकता है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार अपनी नीति को बदलती और राष्ट्रपति को यह सिफारिश न करती। लेकिन आप ने उन के कहने के अनुसार उन को मौका दिया, और इस अवसर का दुष्प्रयोग गृह मंत्री जी ने किया है, और आज वह राष्ट्रपति का हुक्म ले कर हमारे सामने आए हैं। अब पार्लियामेंट को कोई मौका ही नहीं रहता अपनी बात रखने का। इसलिए मैं आप के मारफत यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि कल आप ने उन के साथ जो दया की, उनको जो आप ने सुविधा दी, उस का उन्होंने ने गलत फायदा उठाया। और लोक सभा को उस के अधिकारों से वंचित किया। कल ही ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव आना चाहिये था और कल ही उन का वक्तव्य होना चाहिए था। इसलिये मैं इस सम्बन्ध में आप की व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप नियम पढ़ लें, कि जिस वक्त ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव आता है तो गवर्नमेंट को हक होता है कि वे या तो उसी वक्त उस का जबाब दे दें या वक्त मांग लें, और उन्होंने ने जब वक्त मांगा तो मैं ने उस चीज को हाउस के सामने रखा और हाउस ने कोई ऐतराज नहीं किया

श्री मधु लिमये : हम को पता नहीं था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तो मुझ को भी इस का पता नहीं था। मुझे से सलाह कर के तो यह किया नहीं गया है अगर उन्होंने वक्त लिया तो इस में कोई अजीब बात नहीं है। और मैं ने इस चीज को उसी वक्त हाउस के सामने रखा था। और उस वक्त भी वह कह सकते थे कि उन्होंने ने कोई निर्णय नहीं लिया है और निर्णय लेने के बाद वे जब ब देंगे। इस में भी कोई दोष नहीं था।

Shri N. Dandekar (Gonda): The point raised by Mr. Mukerjee is not so much a technical question of constitutional law as of constitutional propriety and of practices, procedures and understandings. I do beg of you to consider this question, as the protector of constitutional propriety and proper procedures and the protector of the rights of this House as against the executive, if I may put it that way. My submission is not as a matter of technical law where you said the matter should go to court. I accept that. But as a matter of constitutional propriety, I do beg of you to consider this: Is it constitutionally proper in a case like this where the executive are responsible to this House that they should behind the back of the House obtain an executive order of the President, which is no longer challengeable in this House? It seems to me highly improper. I would beg of you to consider it from that point of view.

The second constitutional impropriety, if I may say so, is that the Governor of Kerala, without calling a meeting of the Assembly that has been elected there, has given his report. I am faced with this difficulty. Can the Assembly there be deprived of the right to exercise its sovereign power, within its sovereign limits? Let the House have an opportunity of finding a way out. Grave constitutional improprieties of the kind that go to

[Shri N. Dandeker]

the fundamental roots of constitutional government have been committed. I do not know whether you can find a way out, but I do beg of you to consider it from this point of view.

Shri Ranga (Chfttoor): Sir, I appreciate your difficulty. But at the same time, I take it that you are with us all in feeling very much aggrieved at the way in which this infanticide crime is being committed by this humanist of humanists, at least by his looks—I mean our friend, Mr. Nanda. Yesterday we expected him to respond to our calling attention notice. He was anxious that the House should be indulgent with him and give him the time. We gave it. How has he used this courtesy shown by the House? He has not used it by coming straight to this House and giving this information on his own responsibility, but by giving that wrong advice, according to me, infamous advice, to the President or—I do not know, it is a long thing—the Vice President acting as President, to do this wrong thing, according to me, and then coming here and facing this House with this *fait accompli*. That part of it at least should really invite your censure, and your observation.

Mr. Speaker: Is there any power with me?

Shri Ranga: There is no power. Just as you express your views in regard to decorum in this House, here is this misbehaviour on the part of the Home Minister in regard to this Calling Attention Notice and you can express your views on that.

The third thing is this. As I said, this is infanticide. Advisedly I said so. Sir, it is not within the power, constitutional or moral, of the Governor or the Home Minister here, or on their advice or their authority, to come to their conclusions without doing violence to the real spirit of the Constitution, to do what they have done, by abstaining from convening the Assembly, from giving the ele-

mentary opportunity, the very first opportunity, to the members duly elected according to the Constitution by the electorate there in that State and afterwards coming here in this way.

Sir, hereafter, how would it be possible—kindly consider this—for this Government, functioning in this House as a democratic government, to say in all sincerity that they stand loyal; they keep faith with democratic principles and decencies.

Now they say—I do not want to go very much in detail about the argument he has provided—that one party was called and it was found that it would not be able to command a majority, another party was called and they also made the same discovery. Did they not make the same discovery on an earlier occasion when a minority leader was invited to form the ministry? Did it not also then happen that the Congress Ministry which was at that time beaten at the polls offered to support that minority government just as it has offered to support a minority government here also if it was formed by the Kerala Congress. In spite of all this, how does it lie in the mouth of my hon. friend sitting as he does there, in the name of Indian democracy and the Indian Constitution, to come and tell us that he has given this wrong advice, this bad advice, this infamous advice, this shameful advice to the President?

Sir, I need not say anything more. I am extremely sorry that at the time we were formulating the Constitution—you were also one of the members, I was there and some of my other friends here were also there—we made the mistake of not making any provision to this kind of, what should I say, democratic miscarriage . . .

An hon. Member: Abortion.

Shri Ranga: . . . purposely carried on or that would be carried on

by the Home Ministry or by the Government of the day. If we had only then known or imagined that this kind of a shameful possibility was there, we would certainly have made a provision there so that we would have strengthened your hands and you would have been able to associate with us in condemning this Government in the manner in which it deserves to be condemned.

Mr. Speaker: Should this discussion be continued now? I have no objection if the Members so desire.

An hon. Member: Let it be held over to the next day.

Mr. Speaker: All this criticism can be offered when the opportunity comes.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): We have to ask some questions.

Mr. Speaker: Question I will allow. For these things that are being said now, this is not the opportunity. If the constitutionality or otherwise has to be challenged, as I have already stated, the authority concerned will be the Supreme Court. If any other criticism has to be offered, that it was not constitutionally proper and so on, it has to be done at the proper time. Hon. Members cannot offer their comments in this way.

18.00 hrs.

श्री मधु लिमये : अद्यक महोदय, इस मामले में जम्हूरियत की हत्या हुई है। आप की हिदायत के खिलाफ उन्होंने काम किया है। मैं इस के विरोध स्वरूप सदन त्याग करता हूँ।

(*Shri Madhu Limaye then left the House*)

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): Will the Government permit the release of the arrested elected Kerala Assembly members and con-

vene the Assembly which was elected more than two weeks ago? Instead of that, the Congress party is now adopting the dog in the manger attitude towards the formation of a representative Government in Kerala. Will the Government see that all constitutional possibilities are explored for the formation of a representative government?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has replied all these points. His question is a written one. Probably, he did not care to hear the statement fully.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: Then I will ask another question. In view of the peculiar circumstances obtaining in Kerala, Professor Ranga has suggested the alternative of a Swiss type of Government. Will the Government consider that proposal?

Shri Nanda: We have a written Constitution and we have to carry out the directives of its provisions about the obligations which are placed on the Government, the Governor and the President. We are dealing with this matter according to the terms of our Constitution.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: The hon. Minister has just now stated that the leader of the biggest group could not mobilise the necessary majority to form a Government. May I know whether the Government from the very beginning wanted to defeat the major party from mobilising the necessary strength and so deliberately detained even the elected members of the Legislature so that an impression could be created amongst the other parties that even if they join together, there is no use because the Government will not release the MLAs, even after their election, and thus the Government succeeded in deliberately subverting the formation of a majority party Government and they also succeeded in the Kerala elections in that way and stood in the way of the major party by deliberately keeping people inside jail...

Mr. Speaker: He has made the question so involved that no answer would be possible.

Shri Nanda: The reflection contained in the earlier part of the statement of the hon. Member is totally unjustified. As a matter of fact, that party was able to secure the support of some other party, the SSP. Therefore, that did not come in the way of supporting the Communist Party by another party. Then, they have claimed that actually the voters have stood by the Communist Party. That is their claim.

Shri Warrior (Trichur): If I understood the Home Minister correctly, he has stated that the Congress Party is not taking a negative attitude and it will give responsive support to whichever party forms the Government. In that case, why could the Rebel Congress not form the Government? Why did the Government not wait to see whether that party could form the Government? They could have convened the Assembly and asked that party to try to form a Government and face the Assembly with the responsive support of the Congress Party. Why was that experiment not tried before this decision was taken?

Shri Nanda: The Governor tested all the possible permutations and combinations. The Congress Party had said . . .

Shri Daji (Indore): Your statement says that Congress will give responsive support.

Shri Nanda: So far as the Communist Party is concerned, the Congress Party has said that it will not give any support or seek any support. That was the information that the Governor received, that the support of Congress and rebel Congress was not available to the Communists and these two parties had a bigger total than the combined figures of the other parties. Then, the Congress was not at all prepared to support any other

party in that way in the formation of Government.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Ravindra Varma.

Shri Warrior: May I make a submission? The Minister stated that the rebel Congress Members and the Muslim League Members together counted 37 in number and there are 36 Congress Members. Both of them together will form a majority.

Mr. Speaker: He is arguing. He is not seeking a clarification. Any other signatory who want to put a question?

Shri D. C. Sharma rose—

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Sharma's name is not there.

Shri D. C. Shrama (Gurdaspur): I sent one Calling Attention notice.

Mr. Speaker: On this subject?

Shri D. C. Sharma: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I must believe him. Then, he might put his question.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Sir, I do not want to enter into any controversy. But I want to ask one question. Will the common man's welfare be secured better by the arrangements that have been referred to by the Home Minister in his statement than by forming a Ministry singly or in coalition which apparently does not give any hope of stability for any time to come?

Shri Daji: Tilal has given the reply: Self-Government is better than good Government.

Shri Nanda: This consideration was not directly relevant in the recommendation that the Governor formulated. This is a very different thing which I do not think is quite relevant.

Mr. Speaker: The House stands adjourned to meet at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

18.07 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, March 25, 1965/Chaitra 4, 1887 (Saka).