

SHRI GANESH GHOSH (Calcutta South) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, when a difference of opinion grew up between the Governor of Bihar sometime back, Shri Jairamdas Daulatram, and the Chief Minister of Bihar, Shri Shri Krishna Sinha.... (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER : May I request hon. Members to be quiet now; otherwise we will lose time. The Prime Minister has to reply.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Is that recent information?

SHRI GANESH GHOSH : I am asking her some questions, and I shall be glad if she can answer them.

At that time, Shri A. P. Jain, who was also a member of the Constituent Assembly and then a Minister at the Centre and who was recently a Governor, wrote about it, about the conflict between the Governor, Shri Jairamdas Daulatram and the Chief Minister, Shri Shri Krishna Sinha of Bihar. He said "I recollect my talks with Jawaharlal Nehru on that issue. His decision was empirical. He said that he could advise the President to remove the Governor but had no power to tamper with an elected Chief Minister." Shri Jairamdas Daulatram resigned the office of Governor. Is it because that Shri Shri Krishna Sinha happened to be a Congress Chief Minister that the Governor had to go away, whereas in this case, the case of West Bengal, when the United Front Government took office, was it because it was not liked by the Tatas, Birlas, Singhanias and their collaborators and Johnsons and Wilsons, that is why a British stooge, an I.C.S. officer who had all along been licking the boots his European masters had been put above them and directions have been given from the Central Government to deal so shabbily with that government, when a difference arose on such a paltry issue as the date of the convening of the Assembly? Will the Prime Minister kindly answer this question?

I want to ask one more question. The United Front Government in West Bengal was dismissed, as it appeared in the press, by about 8.20 p.m. But in the evening, about 6 O' Clock it was learnt that police arrangements had been very elaborately

made, the army was alerted and the army had taken positions all over the city and suburbs. And it also transpired that the Governor had called in the Chief Secretary, the Inspector-General of Police and the Commissioner of Police. Who did that and how could the Governor act above the head of the Ministry, so long as the Ministry was in office? They talk of the Constitution; they speak of democracy, and this is how they advise their Governor to act. If the Government had been dismissed at 8.15 or 8.20 in the evening, how could the Governor call up the police, the army? And how did they allow the Governor to bring in the police and the army? (*Interruptions*). You speak of the Constitution; you speak of democracy.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Sir, the main information I want to communicate to the Prime Minister is this. By taking the drastic action of allowing an ICS bureaucrat to have an over-riding power to dislodge a democratically constituted Government, this Government has committed a blunder, the immensity of which is yet to be realised by the Centre. I want also to communicate to the Prime Minister that by this process, they have set in action a process of chain reaction of constitutional and popular explosions which will ultimately consume the very fate of Indian democracy. This Government dismissed the West Bengal Government on a charge that the law and order has broken down there and they are also accused of violent activities. (*Interruptions*). After 20 years black-list of misdeeds, this Government has the cheek to make this charge against an administration which has been there for hardly 8 months. (*Interruptions*).

Calcutta is burning; West Bengal is burning. Today morning I have got a telephonic message that 7 to 9 persons have been killed, more than 60 persons have been seriously injured by bullets and more than 1000 people have been arrested. Military is patrolling all over the area and some parts of Calcutta and round-about areas are under curfew. I want to ask whether the responsibility of letting loose violence is on the UF Government or the new government—the stooge of the Congress Party—which has been installed there?

On 22nd, Hartal was declared all over West Bengal. Uptil 4 PM there was not a ripple

[Shri Samar Guha]
 of any disturbance anywhere in West Bengal. But when in a jeep, two former ministers—one Bangla Congress representative, one PSP representative and one F.B. and other SSP representative—went to offer satyagraha in the maidan in true Gandhian tradition, the police was let loose to make a barbarous assault on those two persons who were ministers just 20 hours before. And after that, there was repercussion and reaction, as a result of which now violent activities are taking place. Therefore, I accuse this Central Congress Government and also their stooge, the new government—they are solely responsible for the violent activities going on there. There is some sort of vicarious pleasure and jubilation on the side of the Congress that non-Congress Governments are being toppled here, there and perhaps everywhere tomorrow. In West Bengal, this is the feeling of the patriotic people, (*Interruptions*) . . . that by this blunder, they have forced the whole of West Bengal into the clutches of anti-national forces whom we were trying to combat. And now by this blunder Congress is helping those elements who aspire to create an Indian Vietnam in the eastern region of India. By this blunder, they have pushed the whole patriotic people of West Bengal to the side of the anti-national and anti-social forces.

Therefore, I conclude by saying that the Congress Government and the Centre have not only sealed the fate of the nationalist people and parties of Bengal, for which they will have to pay the price heavily, but by this blunder they have also thrown West Bengal, and almost the whole of the eastern region, to the clutches of those forces, which they piously say, they want to combat.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North-East) : I am only asking a question. I am not raising any debate. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : The ruling party is helping the anti-national forces. You had the cheek to say these things. . . . (*Interruptions*). After 20 years of monopoly rule, you are saying this. . . . (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. I would request hon. Members on both sides to

keep the dignity of the House. I have called Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : I ask the Prime Minister if she knows, and if she does not know whether she would make enquiries even at this stage, that round about 4 O'Clock in the afternoon on the 21st there had been a communication from the Governor of West Bengal, Shri Dharma Vira, to the then Chief Minister, Shri Ajoy Kumar Mukerjee, requesting him to let him know whether he was agreeable to have an earlier session of the Assembly, earlier than the 18th of December, in answer to which the then Chief Minister, Shri Ajoy Kumar Mukerjee had communicated to the Governor that he was meeting his Cabinet colleagues on the 23rd, that is, day before yesterday, and that he would communicate the position if possibly he could convene the Assembly a little earlier than the 18th of December. In view of this fact, and also in view of the fact that heavens would not have fallen if the Ministry was not pushed out of the picture in the dastardly way in which it was done, may I know if government knew all about this, and in spite of the communication of the Chief Minister that he was telling the Governor about a possible earlier date for the convocation of the Assembly than the 18th of December, if in view of all that, they still went ahead in the bandit fashion and pushed out the Ministry in this way. I want a categorical answer to this.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI *rose*—

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peermade) : The liquidator of democracy is standing up to speak. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Lady toppler. . . . (*interruptions*).

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have sat listening with great attention to the speeches which have been made, because nothing is so stimulating as good, sharp criticism. But what have we heard here? We have heard some wool-gathering in the labyrinth of oft-repeated saws. Very little of what we have heard is new. I have thought that perhaps on the issue of West Bengal the opposition would be united.

But what did we see? We heard that Professor Ranga approves of the action and, in fact, thinks that it was overdue.

We find that even before the motion is moved, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee gets up to assure himself that it is not on any specific issue, that it does not in fact specially mention West Bengal. This is the nature of this no-confidence motion. What we have heard, we have heard since I have been in this House, I forget how many times. The same old arguments about foreign policy. Not a single new argument has been made . . . (*Interruptions*). Therefore, there was no sense in having several no-confidence motions tabled at the beginning of the session, then withdrawing them and then two days later feeling that the matter is very urgent and the same things have to be repeated about foreign policy, about economic policy, about food policy and about all other policies.

Hon. Members will have to excuse me if I also repeat myself because obviously the same questions, when the situation remains the same, must have the same answers. I look forward to criticism not only in this House but anywhere. As I said before, I find it most stimulating. In a motion of no-confidence, what is it that we look for? We look for some alternative policy, some broad framework at least of an alternative policy, which the Government can follow. But when we find not one alternative policy but as many alternative policies as there are parties, and sometimes as there are Members in the same party, then I very humbly submit that there is not much sense in such no-confidence motions. In fact, the only thing which hon. Members in the Opposition have in common is some kind of a conditioned reflex which comes into action at the very mention of the word 'Congress'.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Very well prepared this time.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am always well prepared.

Our hon. friend, Professor Ranga, was so impatient to hit out at me that he did not bother to wait to ascertain his facts. He accused me of going to Moscow for—I am going to quote his words—"the 50th anniversary of their Communist Party". These were his words. Actually, I was

invited and I accepted the invitation to attend the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Soviet State which even Professor Ranga in this very same speech, very generously permitted me to do, saying—again I quote his words—"the Prime Minister should have gone for the 50th anniversary of the Socialist Republic". The invitation was a specially warm one from a friendly neighbour with whom we have very close relations.

This is but one example that I am quoting of the incorrect statements and vague generalisations which are constantly being made by hon. Members of the Opposition without any regard for accuracy.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Was there the head of any other non-Communist Government?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : That is beside the point. I am glad hon. Member thinks that there are Congress governments in other parts of the world! In one thing they are correct, that there are governments which are friendly to the Congress Government in India.

I went to the Soviet Union in the same spirit as our President went to attend the Centenary celebrations of Canada. And we propose, no matter how many people from the Opposition shout about this matter, to adhere to this civilised practice and not to be misled by out-of-date, cold war attitudes. Indeed, if this world had accepted or had adhered to this cold-war way of thinking, there would be today no hot lines. . . . (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. L. SONDHY : Why did you not solve this problem then? (*Interruptions*).

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Please keep quiet. I can handle everybody here. . . . (*Interruptions*).

As I said, there would be today no hot lines, there would today be no meetings at Warsaw nor would there be other contacts which nations must maintain with friends and foes.

In the last General Elections, governments of many different views emerged. This House is aware that I welcomed the emergence of these governments, I welcomed them publicly, and I welcomed them in my meetings with the Chief Ministers. It

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

was not motivated by any narrow party motivation. I felt confident that our federal system would respond to the changed political situation and, in fact, I did every thing I could to discourage any attempt to topple these governments. Not only I as the Prime Minister, but I can also speak for all my colleagues, that in their respective departments they did their best to allow these governments not only to function effectively but to help them in every way that they could, because we believed that in so doing democracy would be strengthened. If all their demands could not be met, it was not that we did not wish to meet them but it was because of our very genuine difficulties, lack of resources, lack of foodgrains, lack of many other things. These difficulties were faced not merely by the non-Congress governments, they were faced equally by governments of the Congress Party, who were blaming us equally for not looking after their interests. We have been blamed on the floor of the House and outside for paying more attention to the non-Congress governments and not looking after the people in the Congress States because they do not make a noise about their difficulties.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : Why make untrue statements?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : What did we see on the other side? The non-Congress Governments were consistently trying to blame the Centre for anything which went wrong. The effort to make this different party system work was supposed to be entirely one-sided; it was only on the side of the Congress, the Central Government, that we were to make every effort to see that things went smoothly while, on their side, they could say what they liked, when they liked and on whatever occasion they found suitable to make comments against the Congress governments, whether that was the occasion for such a comment or not.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : How much rice did you give to West Bengal?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am coming to all those things.

Therefore, the effort to pull together was entirely one-sided and we saw the leaders of the State Governments often holding

conventions to bring down the Congress governments in the States and in the Centre, openly, without any secrecy or anything.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : You told Mr. Dharma Vira to go ahead with his plans. . . . (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order; no interruptions please.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : We saw minimum programmes, strange alliances, coalitions and all other combinations healthy and unhealthy. But we wanted the people to judge for themselves. We still hold to that policy. But when the internal stresses and strains within coalition governments produce disarray and conflict, then the Centre should not be treated as a scapegoat for all the troubles that might arise from them.

I must admit that political defections of the kind which have marred our political life have tended to bring democratic processes to disrepute. All of us who have the well-being of the country and of democracy at heart cannot but feel deep concern that representatives elected on a particular party platform, on a particular party ideology, should with such ease and facility, cross over and re-cross without even making the effort of explaining what political principles were involved in such defections.

All of us, on whatever side of the House, cannot but deplore this. I think, it is pointless to apportion blame as to who started this, when, how or where. Let us look now to the future and deal with this in a manner so as to strengthen our democratic institutions.

Now, certain allegations have been made about West Bengal. Just now before I was to speak, you, Mr. Speaker, informed us that we would get some latest information and I listened very carefully to the two or three members who spoke just before me. But I found that, far from giving any information, they were expressing certain opinions. (Interruption). Prof. Mukerjee did ask one question as to whether we knew about a particular communication, which he mentioned. I must confess that I have no information about this.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE : Would you make enquiries and find out? (Interruptions).

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Mr. Samar Guha also....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : They threatened to resign....

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Who threatened to resign? Anyway, Mr. Samar Guha made a very excited speech, but in the course of that speech, as you will perhaps have noticed, he himself remarked that his group was preparing to fight the anti-national forces in the united front. These are not my words; these are the words which the House heard just five minutes ago from Mr. Samar Guha. (*Interruption*) Who, Sir, has been advocating violence in West Bengal? Not now when these incidents have taken place, but for months! We have all been reading the speeches reported in the newspapers. Mr. Samar Guha has obviously far more inner information about this matter than those of us who have been seeing only newspaper reports. We have read such things as a Minister saying that those who defected would be skinned alive.... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : What is the source of information?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Newspapers.

I might add that perhaps we also share some of the sources which Mr. Samar Guha has at his disposal.

My colleague, Prof. D. C. Sharma, was trying to read out Mr. Ajoy Mukerjee's statement. I wish he had been allowed to do so because it is very illuminating. I would very much have liked to do so myself, but the time is short and, therefore, I shall read only a sentence of it. (*Interruptions*). In this statement, Mr. Ajoy Mukerjee clearly stated that the Left Communists' allegation of a "desperate conspiracy" is baseless. I should like to remind the House that this is not the statement which he made on the eve of his resignation or, rather, proposed resignation, but it is the speech which he made on the 16th October, after he had decided to continue in Government. Please note the difference in date. In that he says :

"...a wing of a political party is openly inviting China to help the party in bringing about an armed revolution"

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Shame, shame !

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : "starting in West Bengal. Such a tendency should be nipped in the bud. Unfortunately, I got opposition in this matter even from some of my friends in the United Front."

Sir, I must state that I am not happy at what is happening; in fact, I am exceedingly sad. I have great admiration for the people of Bengal. In the history of India's resurgent renaissance they have played a unique and distinctive role. They have given us our top leaders in many fields—in politics, in science, in literature, in art and in religion. They have given us our national anthem. I have no doubt that.... (*Interruptions*). they will be able to go through these difficulties and that they will, as in the past, once again march towards progress in peaceful condition.

Sir, I do not wish to go further into this matter because it was dealt with in detail by the Deputy Prime Minister yesterday and it has also been dealt with during the last two or three days by the Home Minister. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : Have you the courage to go and meet the people of West Bengal?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The purpose of our Constitution is to provide a Government which preserves and promotes peace and order, a government dedicated to the rule of law.... (*Interruptions*).... and the welfare of the people.

Some Members even in this House, even in the course of this debate, have talked of violence. I would appeal to them not to indulge in such talk.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : You go and tell them.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Shri Dange even talked of 'gheraoing' the High Court. Violence will not achieve any ends. There is no provision in the Constitution substituting orderly processes by mob violence in the streets. It is the duty of us all to resist such violence.

Sir, I was also disturbed when some Members, perhaps in the excitement of the debate, made what I can only call, somewhat irresponsible observations regarding our Army and what happened in Pakistan

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]
and so on. These, Sir, I submit, are the voices of despair. They are the voices of those who lack confidence in India and her people. They are the voices of those who do not believe in the validity of our democratic system. I have tremendous faith in the maturity and wisdom of the Indian people. I have confidence also in the valour and very high patriotism of our fighting forces. (*Interruptions*).

I deplore that they should be dragged into a political debate of this kind. (*Interruptions*).

I referred to the patriotic valour of our fighting forces. Does the hon. Member deny our fighting forces, their patriotic valour?

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO JOSHI : I do not doubt their valour or patriotism. I was talking about those two citizens of ours who are rotting in the Lisbon jail....(*Interruptions*).

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने प्रधान मंत्री जी से महज एक सवाल किया था कि . . .

MR. SPEAKER : She is not yielding. That is the parliamentary practice. No, Mr. Joshi. Parliamentary practice is that only if she yields you can put a question, and I have no objection. But she has not yielded. No, please.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : As I have already mentioned in the beginning, all the old views repeated many times on our foreign policy were again expressed in the course of this debate and specially, by the mover of the motion. Sir, how much India is respected or India's views are respected, cannot be judged by those who are completely cut off from the realities of the international situation....

AN HON. MEMBER : 'P' form.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : but by what attention is paid to our views in the councils of the world and the importance that is attached to our statements by the leaders of foreign countries.

15 HRS.

I strongly repudiate the statement made by Shri Madhu Limaye, which I consider irresponsible and false, regarding what I have said about Viet Nam in various capitals. At no time has there been any inconsistency

in my views on the Viet Nam conflict, and I have always expressed them very frankly, no matter where I have gone.

The Government of India's policy is to live in freedom, political freedom and economic freedom, and we wish the same for others. That is why in all forums we have been against colonialism, racialism and other forms of domination.

AN HON. MEMBER : But in favour of PL-480.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : We are against interference in our internal affairs, and in the same way, we are against interference in other people's internal affairs.

After political independence, economic independence is a must for us. The world is divided into rich and poor countries, and the gap is a widening one. We must, therefore reconstruct the economic order so that an orderly transfer of resources is possible to enable developing countries to increase their rate of growth.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : We want freedom from you.

AN HON. MEMBER : He will never get it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : For this, we want no charity, but opportunity for larger economic co-operation.

Some hon. Members made deference to our economic situation and our development plans. The Deputy Prime Minister yesterday did touch upon this subject. It is not a fact that planning has been abandoned. The Planning Commission has been reconstituted, and is giving a fresh look to the problems facing the country and is considering ways and means for stabilising and reviving the economy in a planned manner. It is proposed to take up the work of the Fourth Plan in January, 1968 after the completion of the annual plan for 1968-69.

Due to the very difficult economic conditions in the last two years, of which hon. Members are well aware, and particularly because of the unprecedented drought, our industrial activity, national economic growth and demand were adversely affected. Prices went up and resources seriously rapped.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : That was because they had to pay contributions to the Congress Party's election funds.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : This threw the economy out of gear. It is hoped that with the revival of agriculture, the process of rehabilitation and growth will catch up and that we shall soon progressively go up the ladder of planned economic growth.

I should like to point out that sometimes when we talk about our country, we tend to see it in isolation; we want certain ideal conditions for our country. We do not take cognizance of the experience of history and of other parts of the world. In the whole course of human history, it can be seen that in no country has the economy shown a continuous upward swing, not even in the best organised or even in the most advanced countries.

There are always ups and downs, and there are very often backward movements. If we had drought or recession, these are problems which should be dealt with on the plane of constructive criticism. If we were to lose heart at the first taste of such a reverse on the economic front which is caused by factors often out of our control, there would be little inducement to go on working and struggling.

Against the long and rather repetitive list of charges and failures, brought out by hon. Members of the Opposition which have not even been substantiated, let me say something about what we have been able to achieve in this short time. 1

When the Government took office in March this year, the country was facing the bleak prospect of famine. There was an acute food shortage in many states and we had the tremendous task of providing food to over 500 million people. Never before in history has any government had to meet such a gigantic challenge. Yet we faced it boldly and with courage.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR : And the country is getting two ounces of rice per day!

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The general elections brought about State Governments which were not wholly cohesive. They were in opposition to the Party in power at the Centre. But we colla-

borated with them fully to meet the challenge of starvation. Whatever else may be said by members on the other side, they cannot say that we did not succeed. Their own colleagues in the States have borne testimony to our success in saving millions of lives.

The failure of the crops had placed a tremendous strain on the economy. Our resources were taxed to the maximum to import food. The buying power of our people went down, prices went up, unemployment had risen and we were in the midst of a recession. It cannot be said now that we are out of the woods; certainly not. We face a difficult situation, but I feel we have turned the corner. Our crop prospects are good, cash crops are also comparatively plentiful, prices are levelling out and exports, I see from statistics, are picking up (*Interruptions*). Of course, nature has been bountiful this season. But let us not forget that we have also laboured hard to increase our agricultural yields. New types of seeds and fertilisers, better irrigation, all have greatly contributed to this improved picture. All I can say is that whether it was in the political field or in the economic field, this Government has acted firmly and courageously to meet the challenges that came up and to fulfill its responsibilities towards the people. I have no doubt that when the time comes, the people will judge us kindly.

I was surprised to hear an old argument from Shri Prakash Vir Shastri. I doubt if this particular argument has been used in any other parliament of the world. The blame for the Opposition not being strong here is put on us, on the Government. Is it not a little amusing that amongst our many tasks is also the one to undertake to strengthen the Opposition?

One other Member mentioned something about slowing down of rail movement. I can assure him this : I know that it has been slowed down. But this is something which was done one whole year ago. It has been slowed down for various reasons. Obviously, I do not have time here to go into all the details. But many of these questions have been asked before and full answers have been given. If they have not been, questions can always be asked again.

I should like, as I conclude, to appeal to members on both sides of the House to

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

rise above the immediate and to think in terms of the larger perspective of history. We have entered the third decade of freedom. One half of the nation has been born after we have become free. They have, therefore, no knowledge of what bondage meant nor of the struggle to break through that bondage. What do we want them to feel? What sort of picture do we want to give them of freedom? Do we want them to think that freedom is merely the greed for power? Or do we want them to feel proud of their heritage and have some hope in their future?

Criticism, as I said, is welcome. But let us not try to check the springs of confidence. We have a tremendous job ahead of us and in the next five or ten years we can realise the fruits of our investments, our investment in development, our investment in democracy. It is in these coming years that we can become self-reliant, and, Sir, I am confident that we shall become self-reliant.

Let not history record that this group of legislators spent their time in bickering and denigration and forgot to water the roots of confidence and hope.

With these words, I need hardly add that I ask this hon. House to reject the motion.

15.11 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Shri Limaya. I request him to be brief.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : क्या मतलब है ? इस तरह से नहीं चलेगा । जितना समय मुझे चाहिये, आप दें ।

अभी इस सदन ने प्रधान मंत्री जी का जवाब सुना । बहस के दौरान मैं जिन मुद्दों को उठाया गया था, जो आलोचना की गई थी, उन में से किसी भी मुद्दे का या आलोचना का जवाब उन से नहीं मिला (इन्टरप्राइज) । मैं अभी साबित करता हूँ । यहां कई संवैधानिक और राजनीतिक बातें उठाई गई थीं । प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस सवाल को टाल दिया और कहा कि उप प्रधान मंत्री ने सारी बातों का जवाब दे दिया था ।

अब उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप देखें कि उप प्रधान मंत्री जी ने क्या जवाब दिया था । कल श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने बंगाल के बारे में बोलते हुए दो संवैधानिक मुद्दे यहां पर खड़े किये । मैं उनका वाक्य उद्धृत करता हूँ :

"The Governor was entitled to dismiss the Chief Minister the moment it was proved to him that the majority was not with him."

यह जब उन्होंने वाक्य कहा तो तत्काल आपको याद होगा मैंने केरल का जिक्र किया था और उन से कहा था कि अगर यह आपका भाष्य है, अगर यह सरकारी नीति है तो क्या वजह है कि बारह साल पहले इसके बिलकुल विपरीत काम आपने किया । पश्चिमी बंगाल की विधान सभा में सदन में अजय मुखर्जी को सरकार के खिलाफ कोई अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव पास नहीं हुआ था । गवर्नर की यह व्यक्तिगत राय थी कि अब अजय मुखर्जी के साथ बहुमत नहीं रहा । लेकिन जो केरल की घटना मैं आपके सामने रख रहा हूँ उस में तो विधान सभा में वोट हो चुका था । उसके बाद मोरारजी देसाई के कहने के अनुसार राजप्रमुख को, गवर्नर को तथा केन्द्रीय सरकार को ऐसी सरकार को एक क्षण के लिये भी सत्ता में नहीं रहने देना चाहिये था । इनके शब्द हैं :—

"The moment it was proved that the majority was not with him."

लेकिन उन्होंने केरल में यह नहीं किया और पांच-छः महीने तक अल्पमत वाली सरकार, जो सदन में हार चुकी थी उस सरकार के हाथ में इन्होंने सरकार की बागडोर रखी । इनके कहने में कहीं भी आप संगति नहीं देखेंगे, सामंजस्य नहीं देखेंगे, मेल नहीं देखेंगे । जब इनके लिये एक चीज अनुकूल होती है तब ये वैसा भाष्य करते हैं और जब वह विपरीत जाती है तो दूसरी बात कहते हैं । मोरारजी देसाई साहब ने कल यह भी कहा था :

"After losing the majority, no Chief Minister has a right to ask for a mid-term poll."