

Shamshan Bhoomi in Rajouri Garden Extension

1208. **Shri M. R. Krishna:**
Shri Rameshkhari Prasad Singh:
Shri J. P. Jyotishi:

Will the Minister of **Health and Family Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government have taken a decision to remove the "Shamshan Bhoomi" from the Rajouri Garden Extension area; and

(b) if so, when the orders are likely to be implemented?

The Minister of Health and Family Planning (Dr. Sushila Nayar): (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

13 hrs.

RE: MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT AND CALLING ATTENTION NOTICES

RESIGNATION BY SHRI NANDA AS MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: I have received three adjournment motions and six Calling Attention Notices in respect of the Home Minister's resignation.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): I have tabled a Privilege Motion.

Mr. Speaker: When I have rejected that, why should we raise it now?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Why was intimation not given to the House here?

Mr. Speaker: Is the Prime Minister making any statement on that?

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: When?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I think at about one o'clock.

An hon. Member: Why not now?

Mr. Speaker: Then I will hold this over and just wait for the statement at one o'clock.

1966 (Ai) LSD-6

Shri S. M. Banerjee: If she is making a statement at 1.00, Sir, kindly hear me for half a minute.

Mr. Speaker: What else does he want? She is making a statement at 1.00.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, you have rejected my privilege motion. Kindly hear me . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. This cannot be raised in this manner. No reference to Lok Sabha was needed. There is no question of any breach of privilege. I have disallowed it and he cannot raise it now in this manner.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You have ruled many times that when the Parliament is in session such statements should be made first in the House.

Mr. Speaker: That does not apply here, that is a different thing altogether. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): When is the Prime Minister making the statement?

Mr. Speaker: At one o'clock.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is the Home Minister also making a statement; under the rules he can.

Mr. Speaker: That I do not know. (*Interruption*). When that statement is coming, how can I have a preliminary discussion now and then take a decision? It is not possible.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): The Prime Minister is coming. She can make the statement now. (*Interruptions*).

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Sir, I received Shri Nanda's letter only late last evening as well as the copy of his Press statement, both of which have appeared in the Press today. I have no desire to join

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

issue with or comment upon the observations made by Nandaji either in his letter or in his statement to the Press. I do not think that it would serve any public purpose to go into them (*Interruption*). I would only like to say, it was after deep and most anxious thought and with much regret that I decided to recommend to the President acceptance of Shri Nanda's resignation (*Interruption*). Speaking personally, it has been a matter of painful parting of an old and trusted colleague whose hard work and integrity were appreciated by us all. As I have said to Shri Nanda in my letter, I hope that his cooperation and wise counsel will continue to be available to us, the Government and this country.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

Mr. Speaker: When a statement is being made, no point of order arises in the middle. Let the statement be made.

श्री बागड़ी: प्वाएंट ऑफ आर्डर हर समय उठाया जा सकता है।

Mr. Speaker: No point of order . . . (*Interruptions*). Order, order. Let Shri D. C. Sharma resume his seat. Now, has the Prime Minister concluded her statement?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Yes, that is all that I have to say.

Mr. Speaker: The statement to the press by the Home Minister has raised many controversial issues. The Prime Minister in her statement has simply stated that she would not like to say anything on that. In that case, since some clarifications are being demanded by others, I will have to admit at least a calling attention notice.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): We have to be asked to explain why we think that

the adjournment motion ought to be admitted. After you have heard us, and after consulting them if they have something to say as to why the adjournment motion should not be allowed, then you can take a decision. You may ask for clarification from other members of the opposition or any other member and then take your decision. You cannot straightway say that the adjournment motion is not going to be admitted.

Mr. Speaker: Now Shri Ranga may say whatever he wants to say about the failure of the Government.

Shri Ranga: I have given notice of my adjournment motion for different purposes. One is this. The Home Minister himself has stated in his letter of resignation that he had written to the Prime Minister that he was not getting personal support from the Prime Minister, to which he was entitled, and political support to which also he was certainly entitled. He was also not getting complete co-operation and support from his Secretary, he brought this fact to the notice of the Prime Minister, not once but several times, but, in spite of it, the Prime Minister did not strengthen him. Thirdly, there was an instruction given through the Ministry to the Delhi Administration that there should be no demonstrations within a distance of two miles from Parliament. In regard to this, the Home Minister wanted information and confirmation of the steps that were being taken in regard to this matter. The Secretary took more than one month before he gave that information to the Home Minister. This was the kind of non-co-operation he was getting, rather obstruction. Then, on top of it, he made it clear that he wanted a change in the Secretary of his Ministry and he needed the support from the Prime Minister, but he did not get it. What is more, the Home Ministry is supposed to be in charge of the personnel question, appointment of various Secretaries.

Mr. Speaker: So far as the admissibility of the adjournment motion is concerned, he cannot go into all these details.

Shri Ranga: The admissibility of the motion comes in this way. We are assured that there is joint responsibility of the Cabinet and the Prime Minister is the head of the Cabinet. When the Home Minister, who is next only to the Prime Minister, according to their own order of priority, complains that he did not get that co-operation from the Prime Minister and he asks for change of Secretary and he did not get support from the Prime Minister, when the Home Minister, who is really in charge of this procedure that should be followed as to which person should be the Secretary in which Ministry—if any one of the Ministers were to be dissatisfied with his Secretary and wants to have a change of Secretary the proper person for him to go to is the Home Minister to get his Secretary changed.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ranga should realise . . .

Shri Ranga: Bear with me, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Ranga should realise that these are the details as to what are the procedures that are to be followed.

Shri Ranga: It is not that point.

Mr. Speaker: This is not relevant at this stage.

Shri Ranga: Should I not go into the functions of the Home Minister as to what are the functions of the Home Minister? Every one of these Ministers, each one of them, cannot ask for his Secretary to be changed to some other Ministry. No. He can do it only through the Home Minister and the Home Minister is supposed to be in-charge of all the Secretaries as to how they should be deployed and so on. He can do it only with the support and the concurrence of

the Prime Minister and it is for that reason that the Cabinet Secretariat has come to be established in this country. The Cabinet Secretariat had failed in its duty in supporting the Home Minister because it would not help the Home Minister to change even his own Secretary, not to speak of changing other Secretaries if and when the other Ministers want a change. Therefore, the result has been . . . (*Interruption*).

As a result of the failure repeatedly of the Prime Minister to sustain the authority of the Home Minister, the Home Minister was not able to discharge his functions at the head of the Ministry, at the head also, as one who is responsible for the deployment of Secretaries from one Ministry to another and for proper behaviour. It is for these reasons that I say, since the Prime Minister holds her office only on the authority of the President and the Constitution which charges the Prime Minister to maintain unity of the Ministry, joint responsibility—they expect cooperation and give to operation—that this House has the right to discuss this serious failure on the part of the Prime Minister to sustain the authority of the Home Minister which has resulted in serious dislocation of the ministerial responsibility the activity of this Ministry and also the unfortunate and regrettable events and incidents that had taken place the other day and in the sudden resignation of the Home Minister about whom the Prime Minister herself was prepared to say that he was a man of integrity, a man of hard work, and that he was a loyal colleague. Therefore, I request you to allow my adjournment motion to be discussed in the House

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard Mr. Ranga . . .

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kesergod): I have given a Call Attention notice. . . .

Shri Tyagi: Sir, with your permission, I want to raise a point of order.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I have given a Call Attention notice.

Mr. Speaker: That is not being taken up now . . . (*Interruptions*) Order, order. I am not going to hear all Members here and have a regular debate on its admissibility.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: A few Members may be allowed.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard one leading Member and I will hear Mr. Madhu Limaye . . . (*Interruptions*) Order, order.

Shri Ranga: The leaders of the groups have the right . . .

Mr. Speaker: No.

Shri Ranga: That is the usual procedure. You may follow any procedure. The usual procedure is that.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya (Serampore): At every *dak khana* and at every bus stop this is being discussed. And you cannot discuss the matter here in Parliament? Everywhere it is being discussed. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: 'Order' means what?

Mr. Speaker: 'Order' means that you should not speak.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May I seek an information from you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: No.

Shri Hem Barua: I want to seek an information from you only. The sadhus demonstrating in front of the Parliament House have steared out Mr. Nanda and in his letter of resignation, Mr. Nanda has raised a number of controversial points. Would you advise us, in your wisdom, to discuss the matter which has become a topic of discussion everywhere?

Mr. Speaker: I am not to advise how it should be discussed. The Member should look into the rules and find out.

An hon. Member: This is one of the methods.

Mr. Speaker: I am just dealing with this. This is one of the methods. What is being discussed is whether I can allow it or not.

Mr. Madhu Limaye (*Interruptions*).

Several hon. Members—*rose*.

Mr. Speaker: I have got notices from Mr. Madhu Limaye, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, Prof. Ranga, Mr. Kishen Pattanayak, and Mr. Mani Ram Bagri. I have called Prof. Ranga. That was a different notice. Now I am calling one from the other Group.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I have given notice . . .

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Gopalan, that is a different one altogether. That would be taken up afterwards, after I have decided this. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Tyagi: Are they required to put questions to the Prime Minister or deliver speeches? That must be clarified.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): This Chapter IX governs giving of the notice of adjournment motion and all that. I do not see anywhere in this Chapter any provision for having this sort of discussion. It is for you certainly to decide whether you want to admit the motion or not; maybe, it is a very good case for an adjournment motion to be admitted; it may be a question of public importance; so many important questions have been raised. But I cannot visualise any discussion of the type which is going on, under this Chapter. It does not permit any such discussion. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Mathur would realise that when the Speaker desires some information on how it is

the failure of the Government, he can ask one or two members to explain that. That is all. The rules provide and this has always been happening.

Mr. Madhu Limaye.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur):
rose—

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Limaye is already on his legs. How can I allow another member, if another member stands up and interrupts him?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: My point is different. When I stand up, everybody stands up. Of course, I am not disobeying you.

Mr. Speaker: Let me hear Mr. Madhu Limaye first.

श्री मधु लिमये (मूंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान संबिधान की धारा 74 की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ। वह इस प्रकार है :

“There shall be a Council of Ministers with the Prime Minister at the head to aid and advise the President in the exercise of his functions.”

75(1) इस प्रकार है :

“The Prime Minister shall be appointed by the President and the other Ministers shall be appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister.”

फिर 75(3) इस प्रकार है :

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब क्या आप सब पढ़ेंगे ।

श्री मधु लिमये : सब नहीं पढ़ूंगा । जो बुनियादी चीज है वह इस प्रकार है :

“The Council of Ministers shall be collectively responsible to the House of the People.”

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे हाथ में नन्दा जी के पत्र की नकल है जो कि उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री को लिखा है ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्या यहां पर पूरा पत्र पढ़ा जायेगा ?

श्री मधु लिमये : अगर उसको सदन की टेबल पर रखा जाता तो नहीं पढ़ता । उन्होंने उसको वहां पर नहीं रखा है ।

उसका जो पैरा 2 है उस में उन्होंने लिखा है कि :

“मेरे लायक नौकरशाही का इन्तजाम करना प्रधान मंत्री का फर्ज था । कई बार मांग करने पर भी उन के जो काम करने के तरीके हैं उन के अनुरूप उनको सहायता नौकरशाही की नहीं मिली ।”

उसमें मैं नहीं जाता हूँ । यह साधारण बात हुई ।

आप देखें कि सरकार का प्रजानन्द में क्या काम होता है ? उसका काम होता है कि नौकरशाही पर नियंत्रण रखे । नौकरशाही से हम लोगों को कोई मतलब नहीं रहता है । हम लोगों को मंत्रिमंडल से रहता है और हम अपेक्षा करते हैं कि मंत्रिमंडल नौकरशाही पर नियंत्रण रखेगा । लेकिन इधर क्या हाल है । एक दिल्ली के मामले को लेकर सरकार की असफलता को आपने स्वीकार किया है । अब उनके बारे में नन्दा जी लिखते हैं

I had asked my Secretary to let me..

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने कह दिया है कि उनको सेक्रेटरी की मदद नहीं मिली । दूसरा आपका प्वाइंट क्या है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री नहीं चला रहे हैं सरकार । मैं एक एक करके ला रहा हूँ । अब नौकरशाही के ऊपर मंत्रिमंडल का और

[श्री मधु लिमये]

मंत्रियों का कोई नियंत्रण नहीं है। यह दूसरा मुद्दा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह आ गया है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं केवल मूढ़े रखना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने जो बयान दिया है और पत्र लिखा है उसको सभा पटल पर नहीं रखा गया है। इसलिए, मुझे कुछ थोड़ा सा उसमें से पढ़ना पड़ रहा है। वे रख नहीं रही हैं, इस वास्ते मैं पढ़ता हूँ। एक ही वाक्य है :—

"I had asked my Secretary to let me have the papers regarding the instructions about processions not being permitted within a two-mile radius immediately after the informal meeting of the Cabinet had discussed the subject. Would you believe that the papers actually came to me only today?"

मतलब यह कि जिस दिन इस्तीफा दे रहे हैं उस दिन।

अब यह महत्वपूर्ण है :—

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सब नहीं पढ़ सकते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं सब नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ।

"He has taken one full month to discover that no instructions as stated by Patil do in fact exist."

यह तो रेल मंत्री हैं। ये क्यों हस्तक्षेप गृह मंत्रालय में कर रहे हैं और क्यों गलत बयानी करते हैं। यह क्या शरारत है, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : शरारत का क्या मतलब है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं बताता हूँ। ये लोग सुनना नहीं चाहते हैं। हर एक ने नहीं पढ़ा है। आप निष्कर्ष निकालें। मैं ने निकाला है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप जो बयान कर रहे हैं, उसको मैंने सुन लिया है। आपने तीन प्वाइंट कहे हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : एक वाक्य पूरा करने दीजिये। मैंने खत्म नहीं किया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपका खत्म तो शाम तक नहीं होगा।

श्री मधु लिमये : शाम तक कैसे नहीं ? रंगा साहब को सुना है। मुझे नहीं सुनेंगे। मैं नए प्वाइंट रख रहा हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जितनी भी एडजर्नमेंट मोशंज आती हैं अगर मैं चाहूँ अपनी तसल्ली के लिए तो मैं एक को सुन सकता हूँ। यह जरूरी नहीं है कि मैं सब को सुनूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये : सरकार का भंडाफोड़ हो रहा है। मैं ज्यादा नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ।

"Is it going to be suggested that the omissions of a Secretary, whom I had desired to change, should be foisted upon my head?"

मेरा निवेदन है कि मंत्रिमंडल की सामूहिक जिम्मेदारी का जो सिद्धान्त है उसकी प्रधान मंत्री ने हत्या की है। दिल्ली में जितनी घटनाएँ हुई हैं उसकी जिम्मेदारी केवल गृह मंत्री की नहीं है। सब से ज्यादा आपकी है। आपको ***

श्री त्यागी : ***

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी (गोपालगंज) : ***

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi) : ***

Mr. Speaker: These will not be recorded.

Shri Tyagi: We oppose the adjournment motion.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ला मिनिस्टर ।

The Minister of Law (Shri G. S. Pathak): The question of the appointment of a Minister . . . (Interruptions)

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्ख्वा-बाद) : एक और समूह स्थगन प्रस्ताव वाला है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह हो गया है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सब नहीं आया है । एक समूह और है । अभी आपने सिर्फ दो को लिया है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : और नहीं ।

Shri G. C. Pathak: The question of the appointment of a Minister cannot be discussed in this House . . . (Interruptions). The President alone has got the power to appoint . . . (Interruptions).

श्री बागड़ी : सुनने से मत घबराओ (इंटरप्वांज)

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, बहस का गला नहीं घोंट सकते हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सब को नहीं सुन सकता हूँ ।

श्री मधु लिमये : कोलेक्टिव रिस-पासिविलिटी डिसकस करने जा रहे हैं ।

Shri G. S. Pathak: The question of the appointment of a Minister or of his resignation cannot be discussed in this House for the reason . . . (Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सुनने देंगे या नहीं ? खामोश बैठें । इत्मीनान से सुनें ।

श्री मधु लिमये : इत्मीनान से सुनते हैं ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह सरकार है या महल है (इंटरप्वांज)

Shri G. S. Pathak: Mr. Speaker, the question of the appointment of a Minister cannot be discussed in this House . . . (Interruptions). Therefore, the President alone . . . (Interruptions).

श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह : अगर सुनना नहीं चाहते हैं तो हाउस को एडजर्न कर दीजिये ।

श्री बागड़ी : आपकी सरकार ने इतना पाप किया है कि उसमें यह बह जायेगी ।

श्री मधु लिमये : ये त्रिकुल इन्टेलिजेंट बोल रहे हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने इसका फौमला नहीं देना है ।

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : मेरा एक प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : इनका प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर है ।

श्री किशन पटनायक : 356 के अन्तर्गत मेरा एक प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं एक आदमी को सुन सकता हूँ । ला मिनिस्टर को मैंने बुलाया है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर सब से पहले होता है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह नहीं हो सकता है । मैं उनको सुनने के बाद प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर भी सुन लूंगा ।

श्री किशन पटनायक : 356 के अन्तर्गत मेरा प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मिनिस्टर साहब के एक एक लफ्ज पर डिस्कशन होता चला जाये, यह नहीं हो सकता है । (Interruptions).

Shri G. S. Pathak: The power of appointment (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: If the House does not allow me to function, I will have to adjourn it, I have no option. (Intrusions).

श्री राधनाथ व्यास (उज्जैन) : मैं एक प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर रेज करना चाहता हूँ ।

(Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I am not allowed to function. I adjourn the House for half an hour.

12.33 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till two minutes past Thirteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled at two minutes past thirteen of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

RE-MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT AND CALLING ATTENTION NOTICES—Contd.

RESIGNATION BY SHRI NANDA AS MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS—contd.

Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah): Sir, I want to say about the admissibility of the motion for . . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The tempers must have cooled down. I must repeat what I have been saying again and again though I have been unable to enforce it. Unless I identify a Member, he shall not begin to speak, whether he is on this side or on that side. I will have to take action whether he belongs to the Congress or to other side; that would not matter. A Member can stand in his place and attract my attention by saying "Mr. Speaker" or something, but not beyond that. Mr. Dixit.

Shri G. N. Dixit: I want to draw your attention to rule 199 which is relevant to the present situation. You could see that under rule 199, a resigning Minister has got an opportunity to make a statement in this House, and it is said that a Member

who has resigned the office of Minister may with the consent of the Speaker, make a personal statement (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I know that.

Shri G. N. Dixit: I refer you to sub-rule (4) of rule 199 which says: "there shall be no debate on such statement"

Mr. Speaker: That is different thing altogether.

Shri G. N. Dixit: The relevance of this rule is this. That something which is said outside cannot partake of a character of force, or authority, of what is permissible under the rules here. That is one thing. Therefore, a debate is not permissible, under the rules, on the statement which has been made by the resigning Minister. Therefore, the Adjournment Motion, if it is consented to, will amount to a debate in this House.

Then, my second point for your consideration is that under the Constitution, a Minister remains under the pleasure of the President. The Minister functions at the pleasure of the President. These are the words of the Constitution. Pleasure is something which is the personal opinion of the President which is not to be debated or considered anywhere else. (Interruption) And then, President's pleasure is always on the advice of the Prime Minister and therefore it is the Prime Minister's right to have one Minister or the other Minister. So, this Adjournment Motion is absolutely irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker: I have followed him. That is not the question, and that rule is not so relevant here. If he had made a statement here inside the House, then this rule would have applied and there ought not to be a debate. Now, the Minister has taken another course and issued a statement; therefore, that is different from this.

The only two points that have been raised are these: one is that the Minister did not get the co-operation from the Prime Minister or his colleagues. That was one thing. The argument was that he was not getting assistance from his secretariat. He wanted his Secretary to be removed and that was not done; therefore he is not responsible for what has happened. These are the two main points.

An hon. Member: Joint responsibility.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; he did not get co-operation of his colleagues; that is joint responsibility.

श्री मधु लिमये : तीसरा और है, कलेक्टिव रेस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी का ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कलेक्टिव रेस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी का तो मैंने कहा है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : उन्होंने तो कहा कि जो असफलता है वह गृह मंत्री की नहीं है, प्रधान मंत्री और सब की है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : फिर वही कलेक्टिव रेस्पॉन्सिबिलिटी है और क्या है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तीसरा यहां पर यह लाया गया कि इन सब कारणों से देश की स्थिति बिगड़ी, दिल्ली में दंगे हुए और फिर यही घटनाएँ होने वाली हैं क्योंकि फिर प्रधान मंत्री ऐसे मंत्रियों को नहीं हटा पाई हैं जिनमें उनको प्रतिश्रवाम है, यह बात भी है वहां ।

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If they speak while I am on my legs, I cannot understand that. Now, I would like to have answer to these questions that have been raised here. I would like to know what the Prime Minister has to say about them, the specific points that have been raised.

Shri Bagri rose—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I cannot allow him. I will have to ask him to go out.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Sir, I am very sorry that Nandaji has the impression that I was not giving my fullest co-operation to him. I can assure the House that I tried to give the utmost co-operation and to the best of my ability. It can be that I did not agree with some of the things which he wanted and which I had to look at from a larger perspective.

Shri Banga: Even regarding the Secretary?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: One of the things which I wanted to say is this. It has been taken for granted here in the House and perhaps also by Nandaji that I accepted his resignation because of the happenings on that particular day in Delhi. This is not so. It is not at all my intention to lay the blame for what has happened on Nandaji's shoulders. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let the Prime Minister be heard.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: The responsibility, as I said in my speech the other day, Sir, is one which is shared by all of us here; not only the Government but the Opposition and many people outside who have been creating an atmosphere which has led up to the events which have taken place here and in other parts of the country. We cannot run away from that fact; no matter how much shouting there is, that fact remains. (*Interruptions*). As far as the appointment of the Secretary is concerned, that is a departmental affair. There is a special Appointments Committee of the Cabinet which goes into this matter. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: No more debate on that. There is collective responsibility of the Government, no doubt. (*Interruptions*). Order, order. I am

[Mr. Speaker]

not concerned with anything which is not in the motion that is before me. Therefore, I am not concerned with the question whether all should have resigned or not and so on. (*Interruption*). There are two other things besides collective responsibility. One is, the Secretary was not giving the assistance that the Minister desired or the Minister was entitled to. If that was the case, and if it had been happening for a long time, then it was for the Minister to take action, either to go out himself or—

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why should he?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is for the Minister to see how he could continue for a day when the Secretary was not co-operating with him. That cannot be a subject for the Adjournment Motion, the attitude or the conduct of the Secretary. So far as the Prime Minister is concerned, it is alleged in the statement appearing in the press that the Prime Minister did not give that co-operation that he was entitled to. The Prime Minister has made a categorical statement now that she has been giving—

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Who is to be believed? Who is right and who is wrong? (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: When the facts are not admitted or established, then the Adjournment Motions cannot find a place.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Appoint a Committee.

Mr. Speaker: I have some discretion. I will admit the Calling Attention Notices that have been given, including the names of those who have given notice of Adjournment Motions.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I have given a Calling Attention Notice.

Mr. Speaker: I have admitted them. Why should he raise it now?

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): It will not be possible to have a discussion. The Calling Attention Notice will be answered and each Member who has sent the notice will be entitled to put a question, but the matter cannot be discussed. So, because it is a serious subject—

Mr. Speaker: I am not responsible. Now, Shri Gopalan might put a question.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want answers to all the points I have raised in my calling attention notice. In his statement, the Home Minister has said:

“There is serious discontentment in the country as a result of lack of integrity at various levels of administration”.

Then he has referred to rising prices, food scarcity, inequitable distribution, etc. This is a very important matter.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member must realise that this is not a debate at this moment. For a debate, there are other means and he might take recourse to them.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want an answer from the Prime Minister on these points. Mr. Nanda says that as far as policies are concerned, it is not the Minister who makes the policy, but it is the Secretary who makes it.

Mr. Speaker: The Secretary's conduct cannot be discussed here. Here the Minister would be held responsible, not the Secretary.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Mr. Nanda has been aspiring for Prime Ministership in this country. He says there is lack

of integrity at various levels of administration. This is not a simple matter.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to know whether it is a fact?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Yes, Sir. I also want to know whether as Mr. Nanda said, it is the Secretaries who decide the policies or it is the Ministers who decide it.

Mr. Speaker: Policy may be decided by anybody. The Government is responsible here for the policy.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: You are quite right, Sir. It is the Minister's responsibility as to what policy is followed. Who decides the policy in a particular ministry, it is the Minister's responsibility surely.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: That means what Nandaji said is a lie.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: It is not a question of lie. It is for the Minister to support whatever suggestions are made by Secretaries or not to support them and tell them that he wishes to follow another direction.

Dr. Ranen Sen (Calcutta East): Mr. Nanda wanted Mr. L. P. Singh's removal. You did not give him any support.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Did the Prime Minister support him in his policy?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I am sorry I do not know what matters of policy are referred to here. The matter which was referred to in the letter was with regard to the change of Secretary. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Gopalan has asked a specific question regarding integrity at different levels of Government's working. It is not possible to give a categorical answer. There are cases when there is not, and the House knows that we go into those cases. Nandaji himself

was responsible for setting up Vigilance Officers. We are not changing that. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nambiar: It is to the country's advantage that Mr. Nanda has left and I welcome it. It was he who locked up thousands of communists in jail. It is very good he is gone. After his quitting, may we know whether this Secretary who is responsible for the happenings and shootings on that particular day, will be sent out of the Home Ministry and the country will be saved from such people?

Mr. Speaker: That cannot be answered. It is not the removal or keeping in service of any servant that is to be decided here.

Shri Warior (Trichur): In view of the points of dispute raised by Nandaji in his statement, may I know whether the Prime Minister is instituting any enquiry into the serious charges he has levelled against the Secretary and Secretariat and others, and if not, why not?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I do not think there is a case for enquiry. But I shall certainly look into the points he has raised.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuruzha): The Secretary is under a shadow following the statement by the Home Minister. There are many reports circulating about this officer that he is connected with foreign agencies and so on. The Home Minister wanted to remove him. I should like to know whether this issue was brought to her attention or to the attention of the Cabinet or the sub-committee she referred to, at any time, if so at what time it was brought and whether that sub-committee considered this problem and refused to accede to the request of the Home Minister; and if so, why?

Mr. Speaker: Can I ask her to disclose what happened inside the Cabinet?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: This is a very serious matter.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: The Home Minister did ask for the removal of his Secretary. But as I said earlier, many Ministers are asking for either the appointment or the removal of a particular Secretary.

Shri Ranga: The Home Ministry is supposed to be in charge of all these.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: The Home Ministry comes along with other Ministries in this. I have to look at it and decide in the larger interest which person should be where. I gave my reasons to the Home Minister for that.

श्री प्रकाश शीर शास्त्री (विजनीर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री को पूर्ण अधिकार है कि अपनी मंत्री परिषद् में जब और जैसे चाहें परिवर्तन करें। लेकिन देश की चिन्ता होनी इस बात पर स्वाभाविक है जब कोई ऐसी बात किसी मंत्री के हटने पर पता लगे कि मंत्री परिषद् के अन्दर ही अन्दर एक भाग सुलग रही है जिसका परिणाम देश के भविष्य पर पड़ने वाला है। गृह मंत्री श्री नन्दा के वक्तव्य से ऐसा प्रतीत होता है कि उनकी ही नहीं बल्कि कुछ और मंत्री भी मंत्री परिषद् में इस प्रकार के हैं जिनकी सहमति प्रधान मंत्री के साथ नहीं है। क्या यह बात सत्य है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने श्री नन्दा के अतिरिक्त भी कुछ और मंत्रियों से त्याग पत्र मांगे थे। यदि हाँ, तो उनके ऊपर कब तक निर्णय लिये जाने की सम्भावना है जिससे देश में इस प्रकार वातावरण न पैदा हो।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं तो यह उनसे पूछ नहीं सकता, खुद प्रधान मंत्री बतलाना चाहें तो बतला सकते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री नन्दा ने कहा है कि :

"The Secretary has taken one full month to discover that no instructions as stated by Patil do in fact exist. Is it going to be suggested that the omissions of a Secretary, whom I had desired to change, should be foisted upon my head?"

मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि क्या एल० पी० मिह पाटिल साहब को मलाह दे रहे थे या कि पाटिल साहब एल० पी० मिह को मलाह दे रहे थे। अगर यह सेक्रेटरी साहब का दोष था तो क्या सरकार उनके खिलाफ कोई कार्रवाई कर रही है या जांच करने जा रही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सेक्रेटरी के खिलाफ क्या करने जा रही है यह मैं नहीं पूछ सकता। यहां मिनिस्टर रिस्पॉन्सिबल हैं और मिनिस्टर के बारे में ही पूछा जा सकता है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं दूसरी तरह से सवाल करता हूँ। एल० पी० मिह पाटिल साहब को चला रहे थे या पाटिल साहब एल० पी० मिह को चला रहे थे। शायद पाटिल साहब इसका जवाब देना चाहें। कौन चला रहा था किस को।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डा० गम मनोहर लोहिया।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : संविधान के अनुसार प्रधान मंत्री अपने मंत्रिमंडल का गठन या पुनर्गठन, छोड़ना या रखना, अपने विवेक से या काबिना की सम्मिलित जिम्मेदारी से कर सकती हैं। यह बात सभी के सामने आई है कि प्रधान मंत्री अभी भी कुछ मंत्रियों को हटाना चाहती थीं। मैं यह सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या उन मंत्रियों को हटाने की प्रक्रिया उन्होंने पिछले दो तीन दिनों में शुरू की थी, यहाँ तक कि उन मंत्रियों को कह भी दिया था कि आप हटेंगे, और बाद में

अपने विवेक को छोड़ कर, काबीना की सामूहिक जिम्मेदारी के सिद्धान्त को छोड़ कर, कुछ इधर-उधर के दबाव के कारण उनको अपना विचार बदलना पड़ा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डाक्टर साहब, यह सवाल तो मैं नहीं पूछ सकता।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह सवाल तो बिल्कुल जायज है कि सरकार की सामूहिक जिम्मेदारी

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह सवाल यहां नहीं आ सकता कि क्या वह निकालने लगी थी, क्या उन पर कोई प्रेशर आया इसलिये बन्द कर दिया, क्या उनको निकालने वाली है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आगे चल कर भी यह सम्भावना होगी, इसलिये मैंने यह सवाल पूछा। आगे भी इसी तरह की संभावना होगी कि दो, चार, छः महीने बाद कई मंत्री लोग कहें कि मुझ को प्रधान मंत्री से सहयोग नहीं मिला। लेकिन तब तक देश को बहुत जबर्दस्त धक्का पहुंच चुका होगा। इसलिये मैं यह सवाल पूछ रहा हूँ। यह मामूली सवाल नहीं है। (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह सवाल मैं नहीं पूछने दे सकता।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं यह सवाल दूसरे रूप में करता हूँ। नन्दा जी ने कहा कि काबीना के अन्दर और बाहर बहुत से अष्ट तत्व थे जिनकी इच्छा थी कि मैं निकल जाऊँ। यह मैं आप से स्पष्ट कर दूँ कि जो मंत्री चौदह वर्षों तक अष्ट कामों में लगे रहे उनके प्रति मेरी महानुभूति नहीं हो सकती। वह क्यों चौदह वर्षों तक उममें पड़े रहे। लेकिन फिर भी श्री नन्दा ने जो बयान दिया है उससे मुझ को सम्भावना लगती है कि शायद वह अपने पुराने किये हुए कुकर्मों को बदल कर कोई नये रास्ते पर जा रहे हैं, इसलिये मैं पूछ रहा हूँ कि से अष्ट तत्व कहां थे,

कौन थे। प्रधान मंत्री जी बन-नायें जिन्होंने नन्दा जी को निकाला है कि क्या यह सही है कि श्री अतुल्य घोष, श्री बिड़ला के खानदान और उनके हिन्दुस्तान मोटर्स वगैरह के ऊपर नन्दा जी कोई जबर्दस्त कार्रवाई दो-चार दिन के अन्दर करने वाले थे, जिसकी सबब से उनको निकाला गया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले हिस्से के मुतालिक मैंने पहले कहा कि मैं उसकी इजाजत नहीं दे सकता। दूसरे हिस्से के सम्बन्ध में अगर फैंट्स के तौर पर प्रधान मंत्री चाहें तो जवाब दें।

श्रीमती न्दिरा गांधी : इसमें कोई सत्य नहीं है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न उठाना चाहूंगा हिन्दुस्तान मोटर्स के ऊपर।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर। डाक्टर साहब, मैं इस तरह से नहीं चलने दूंगा।

श्री किशन घटनायक : नन्दा जी के बयान से सब से ज्यादा रोशनी जो मिलती है वह यह कि 7 नवम्बर की घटनाओं में दो सम्भावनायें हैं। क्या उन सम्भावनाओं पर प्रधान मंत्री का ध्यान गया है। प्रथम सम्भावना तो यह है कि 7 नवम्बर की जो घटनायें हुईं उन के पीछे जो लोग श्री नन्दा के खिलाफ काबीना के अन्दर या दफ्तरों में उनका कोई हाथ था और कलकत्ते और बम्बई से गुंडे लाये गये थे उस प्रदर्शन में शामिल होने के लिये। दूसरी सम्भावना यह कि सुनील दास और मोहित चौधरी के मामलों में नन्दा जी जो कार्रवाई कर रहे थे उनके खिलाफ अतुल्य घोष और श्री पाटिल थे। क्या सुनील दास और मोहित चौधरी के मामले को और 7 नवम्बर की घटनाओं को दबा दिया जायेगा ?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : अभी मैंने कहा है कि इसमें कोई सच्चाई नहीं है। अभी चन्द दिन हुए ये लोग नन्दा जी को यह कह रहे थे कि वह काफी कार्रवाई नहीं कर रहे हैं और आज मुझे खुशी है कि वे इस तरह की बात कह रहे हैं।

श्री बागड़ी : गृह मंत्री का इस्तीफा सात नवम्बर के वाकाल से बहुत ज्यादा सम्बन्धित है सीधे तौर से या टेढ़े तौर से। दो तीन कारणों से देश की जनता के मन में नन्दा जी के बयान को लेकर आशंका उत्पन्न हुई है। एक तो यह है कि सात तारीख को इस दुर्घटना और सरकारी आम कल्ल के फौरन बाद गृह मंत्रालय में से गृह मंत्री का इस्तीफा क्या इस वास्ते आया है कि वह दोषी समझे गये हैं? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि दोष खाली गृह मंत्री का है और सैक्रेटरी और प्रधान मंत्री का नहीं है? दूसरी बात मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि अफ्रट इनक्वायरी के बारे में प्रधान मंत्री जी यह बतायें कि क्या उनके रहते बिड़ला जी की मोटर कंपनी की जांच नहीं हुई थी और क्या यह भी सही नहीं है कि बाबू अतुल्य घोष का उन लोगों के साथ सम्बन्ध था जो हिन्दुस्तान से गढ़ारी कर रहे थे और उनके बारे में भी कार्य चल रहा था? अगर कार्रवाई चल रही थी तो वह किस स्टेज पर पहुंच गई थी और अब उसके अन्दर कोई हस्तक्षेप होगा या वह इन्क्वायरी बदस्तूर चलती जायेगी? क्या इसमें प्रधान मंत्री सब से ज्यादा जिम्मेवार नहीं हैं? क्या उनकी इखलाकी जिम्मेवारी इसमें सबसे ज्यादा नहीं है और क्या उनको खुद इस्तीफा नहीं देना चाहिये था?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जी केस चल रहे हैं, मोहित चौधरी वगैरह के उनके बारे में सिर्फ बता दिया जाये।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : जो 'कार्रवाई' हो रही है वह तो जारी रहेगी . . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : छूट जायेंगे।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : छूट जायेंगे या नहीं, यह तो कोर्ट के हाथ में है, मेरे हाथ में नहीं है और न ही गृह मंत्रालय के हाथ में है।

जो पुलिस की तरफ से कार्रवाई होती है, मैंने पहले भी कहा है वह किसी खास वजुहात की बिना पर होती है। उसका जवाब देना होता है। यहां पर जो आग लगाई गई और सब जो वाकाल हुए, उसका दोष किसी पर अगर डाल सकते हैं तो उन पर ही डाल सकते हैं जिन्होंने ऐसी भावना पैदा की थी यहां पर।

Shri Ranga: The Prime Minister made a reference to the existence of an appointment sub-committee. May we know, either now or later or through the Press as they have been doing, who are the precious members of that sub-committee, whether that sub-committee came into existence only after she has taken over as Prime Minister or whether it was there during her father's time or during Lal Bahadur Shastri's time, whether when Gobind Ballabh Pantji was there as Home Minister there was any such sub-committee at all, was it not the function of the Home Minister, in fact, in consultation, if need be, whenever necessary, with the Prime Minister, to decide who should be the Secretary for which ministry and so on? I would like to have these facts.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I cannot say when the appointment sub-committee began. It was certainly there since I have come into the Government, since Shastriji was there (*Interruption*). I am told now it was there before also.

It consists of the Prime Minister, the Home Minister and the concerned Minister.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : इंडायरेक्ट वे में सवाल करना मेरा स्वभाव नहीं है, यह मेरे स्वभाव के खिलाफ़ है। मैं सीधा सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट दो कोशिशें कर रही है, शेख अब्दुल्ला को रिहा करना चाहती है और गोकशी जारी रखना चाहती है। क्या यह सही नहीं है कि इन दोनों कामों के बीच में नन्दा जी बाधा थे, सब से बड़ी रुकावट थे, इसलिए उनको मजबूर किया गया कि वे इस्तीफा दे दें ?

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : यह सही नहीं है।

श्री बागड़ी : मंत्रालय में गौहत्या हुई है।

Shri U. M. Trivedi : I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker : Under what rule?

Shri U. M. Trivedi : Under the provisions of rule 199 of the Rules of Procedure. The statement of Shri Nanda has been published in the press. A member who resigns from the Ministry is entitled to make a statement only inside the House. He might make a written statement and if he makes such a statement then, of course, the Prime Minister can make a reply. Here the privilege arises in this way. Can a member of this House give to the press a statement which he is entitled to make only in the House? Will it not amount to a breach of privilege?

Here I want to say this. Ordinarily I would be entitled to raise this question after having given notice to the Speaker of my desire to raise such a question of privilege. But now discussion has taken place here and questions have been asked. I will draw your attention to the provisions of the proviso to rule 225 which

says that the Speaker can, if he is satisfied about the urgency of the matter, allow a question of privilege to be raised at any time during the course of a sitting after the disposal of question. That is why I want to raise this point of order. The consideration for not making this statement in the House might have been not to face the House. If he wanted to make a statement, he should have had the guts to come before the House and make this very statement, the written statement which was published in the press. He ought to have made it here in the House so that we could have heard it from his mouth.

श्री हुकम चग्ग कछवाय : मैंने भी नोटिस दिया है। मेरा भी नाम है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जी नहीं, नोटिस नहीं दिया है।

There is no point of order. It is a special privilege given to the Minister that he can make a statement here, inside the House. By that his other rights are not restricted. Whether it is proper for him to make a statement outside or not, it is for him to decide. Therefore, there is no breach of privilege. I have received notice of a breach of privilege from Shri K. D. Malaviya. I will take it up at the end. Now, Papers to be laid on the Table. Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri.

Shrimati Vimla Devi (Elura) : Sir, I want to submit....

Mr. Speaker : She can write to me. I will look into it. She cannot interrupt the proceedings in this manner.

Shrimati Vimla Devi : I only wanted to submit....

Mr. Speaker : Order, order. Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri.