

[Shri A. N. Vidyalankar]

should be used in such a common manner and that we should look at it from an angle of political expediency.

President's rule was imposed earlier in some other States also. I come from Punjab, where also President's rule was imposed once. So also in PEPHU. Even now there is quite a lot of talk of President's rule being imposed in Punjab, not because the democratic machinery has actually failed there but because we looked at certain problems from the point of view of political expediency. When a political party is in majority in a Legislature, as the Congress was, I do not think there was any valid ground for the imposition of President's rule only to solve immediate difficulties due to inner party conflicts.

If we cherish democratic values and we were wedded to democratic values genuinely, we should feel deeply concerned and pained when we had to impose President's rule and we had to suspend normal working of democratic institutions. Democracy required a special climate for its functioning. If the representatives of the people were in doubt whether they could exercise fully their rights at a time of difficulties, if they thought that it was not for them to solve the problems, and it was the headache of somebody else, who could apply the correctives, then democracy cannot prosper or function in such a set-up. The representatives of the people should always think that it is they and they alone who could solve the problems even when there is a break-down of democracy.

In the Constitution there were no provisions for President's rule or any provision for exercising executives authority, what would have been the position? Suppose a situation arose in England where no party had a majority or the majority of the party was precarious, only a difference of one or two members, what would they do? They would order re-elections by asking the King or Queen to dissolve the Parliament

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue his speech the next day. We will now take up non-official business.

14.30 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

EIGHTY-EIGHT REPORT

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Dabhanga): Sir, I beg to move:—

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 5th May, 1966."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Eighty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 5th May, 1966."

The motion was adopted.

14.30½ hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: PROCLAMATION OF EMERGENCY AND DEFENCE OF INDIA ACT—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shri Surendranath Dwivedy on the 22nd April, 1966:—

"This House calls upon the Government to take steps to revoke the Proclamation of Emergency and to repeal the Defence of India Act without delay."

Time taken is 14 minutes, 1 hour and 46 minutes are left. Shri Dwivedy may continue his speech.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Sir, when I was speaking the other day, I was pointing out