

Minister and the team that came from Madhya Pradesh to represent that State. The hon. Minister when he was Chairman of the Central Water and Power Commission had made certain proposals to put up a large dam in Gujarat on the Narmada river. To that proposal the Government of Madhya Pradesh had registered its protest. Now the whole controversy is that Dr. Rao still clings to that theory of putting up a large dam in Gujarat and that is the reason why Madhya Pradesh is opposing.

Secondly, Dr. Rao unnecessarily dragged in the change of leadership in Madhya Pradesh to the picture. It is that which has created a great controversy, which has injected a new element into this inter-State water dispute. So far, in Maharashtra, Mysore and Andhra Pradesh, in all these three States, unfortunately, there are Congress governments, whereas here, in the Narmada dispute, the controversy is between a Congress Government in one State and a non-Congress Government in other Estate. Over and above that, there is Dr. Rao who represents the Central Government which is also a Congress Government.

Now, Sir, Maharashtra has served notice on the Government of Andhra Pradesh. Mysore is in the process of serving a notice on the Central Government. Now the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh has expressed in no uncertain terms that he does not have any confidence in Dr. Rao. In view of these facts, I would like to pose a question to Dr. Rao himself. Would he be any effective in bringing about a certain rapprochement between the parties as long as he continues to be the Minister in charge of Irrigation and Power ?

DR. K. L. RAO : The various statements made by the hon. Member are entirely incorrect. I never suggested a high dam when I was connected with the CWPC. I know the proposal for a high dam came after 1963 when I was Minister. If the hon. Member had cared to know the facts he could have avoided wasting the time of the House. In 1963 the agreement arrived at between Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat was for a dam of 425. There was no question of 465. The rest of the thing has been completely his imagination. Of course, the hon. Member has been dreaming a good lot of things. So the question of a high dam has not arisen and the proposals are

going on changing from time to time. The question of a high dam has come up only recently.

With regard to the question of one statement being given by the officials of the Central Government and another statement being given by the officials of the State Government, naturally I have to depend on what the officials of the Central Government say. I was not present here in Delhi on the 11th of this month, on the day the talks broke down. The Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh has said that I was here and I was directing the engineers to break up and all that. I do not know what exactly it is, whether I can call it a lie or a fad. The officers of the Central Government are experienced people. They deal with international discussions, discussions with various countries like Nepal, Pakistan and others. They are very highly experienced people. They have a large amount of patience. Naturally I must believe what they say and I have given the facts in the statement. What the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh has stated is entirely his own. I cannot say anything on that. If he wants to indulge in something of the kind of language that he has done; let him do that. I cannot deny him that privilege.

12.19 hrs

Re. MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT AND CALLING ATTENTION NOTICES

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) :  
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे मिला था और मैंने आपसे इस बात की अनुमति चाही थी कि आप उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में हमारे स्थगन प्रस्ताव पर विचार करने का अवसर दें। उत्तर प्रदेश में जो कुछ हुआ है, उस से लोकतन्त्र को आघात लगा है—(व्यवधान)...अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह ऐसा खेल है जो हम भी खेल सकते हैं... (व्यवधान)...

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Hon. Members are only helping to create disorder. They are not helping me at all. Allow him one or two minutes. He came to me and sought my permission. It is not

[Mr. Speaker]

as though he is just getting up and shouting. Of course his point of view was different from my point of view, but we thought we could express our difference of opinion here. Let him have his say. Hon. Members cannot insist that everybody should agree with their views.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : इन के मन में चोर है, अध्यक्ष महोदय, उत्तर प्रदेश में जो लोकतन्त्र की हत्या हुई है; उस के लिये ये सब लोग जिम्मेदार हैं और अपने पाप पर बर्दा डालने के लिये ये शोर मचा रहे हैं। लेकिन इस शोर से कोई आबाध बचने वाली नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन में जब उत्तर प्रदेश में 25 फरवरी को राष्ट्रपति का शासन घोषित किया गया था, उस समय यह मन्त्री महोदय ने कहा था कि विधान सभा भंग नहीं की जायगी, क्योंकि हम उत्तर प्रदेश में जल्द से जल्द लोकप्रिय शासन कायम हुआ देखना चाहते हैं। संयुक्त विधायक दल के नेता दिल्ली आये, राष्ट्रपति जी से मिले और उन्होंने कहा कि हमारा बहुमत है, वे अपने सदस्यों की संख्या भी गिनने के लिये तैयार थे और केवल दो दिन का समय मांगते थे। अब जबकि 25 फरवरी को विधान सभा भंग नहीं की गई थी, दो दिन और भंग न की जाती तो कोई शासमान टूटने वाला नहीं था।

लेकिन विधान सभा भंग करके केन्द्रीय सरकार ने चोर दरवाजे से अपनी हुकूमत उत्तर प्रदेश में थोप दी है। सबसे बड़ी दुःख की बात यह है कि अगर संयुक्त विधायक दल के पास बहुमत नहीं था तो कांग्रेस दल के नेता को सरकार बनाने के लिये आमंत्रित किया जाना चाहिये था लेकिन कांग्रेस के अन्दर फूट है जिसमें केन्द्र के नेता भी शामिल हैं, उन्होंने श्री चन्द्रभानु गुप्त को सरकार बनाने के लिये पसन्द नहीं किया। अब अगर कांग्रेस के पास बहुमत नहीं है तो संयुक्त विधायक दल के पास होना चाहिये, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता कि किसी भी दल के पास बहुमत न हो। विधान सभा

भंग कर और राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करके यह मन्त्री महोदय संघात्मक संविधान को आबाध पहुँचाने का काम कर रहे हैं और यह धाये और भी करेंगे।

यह सच है कि यह मन्त्री वहाँ पर राष्ट्रपति की उद्घोषणा लायेंगे, उस पर सदन को चर्चा करने का मौका मिलेगा लेकिन वह एक नियमित चर्चा होगी। यह प्रश्न बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है, हम इस पर सरकार की निन्दा करना चाहते हैं। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि आप हमारे स्थान प्रस्ताव को पेश करने की अनुमति दें और इस मामले पर आज बहस होनी चाहिये।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) :  
Sir, my adjournment motion.....

MR. SPEAKER : I have received a number of adjournment motions, not one, I do not want to mention all of them because so many of them have been given on this issue. I did discuss this subject with Shri Vajpayee and others and I tried to convince him; naturally, I wanted to be convinced also, if it was possible, it was both ways.

I did state some time ago that during the discussion of the Demands it is not proper to have an adjournment motion for the simple reason that you can censure the government in another way by not passing the Demands. I think I said this some ten days ago. Added to that, if you want to discuss any irregularity committed by the Home Minister, or somebody, as Shri Vajpayee has himself mentioned here, the Proclamation has to come before the House. The Proclamation cannot become effective until the House takes note of it, passes it and approves of it. This House has a right to disapprove of it also and say that what the President has done on the recommendation of the Government is wrong. Therefore, that is also a censure. I mentioned all these things to Shri Vajpayee. Perhaps I could not carry him, or the other friends who gave notice of adjournment motions, with me. Now, if we begin a discussion on this, naturally the discussion on the Demands will be

postponed. I am not interested in the question which government has gone, whether it is a Congress or non-Congress government,

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE** (Calcutta North East): Sir, if you can bear with me for some time, this is an extraordinarily serious matter. We would not have normally thought of an adjournment motion, but we did it in spite of the fact that we knew that the proclamation resolution would be discussed. We know also that in the course of the Demands for Grants we can vote down and censure this Government. But the point is, in regard to the Demands for Grants discussion we are pinned down, very naturally, to the particular Ministry concerned. Here is something which appertains to the entire government and particularly in view of the Speakers, Conference which you, Sir, presided over the other day, which formulated certain principles of conduct which have been hailed all over the country, which had been completely given the go by this Government by the act which they now propose, it raises a new question which goes to the very root of parliamentary functioning, and that is why we request you to allow a discussion, and even though a little time it might be difficult to procure I am sure you could easily do it.

**SHRI HEM BARUA** (Mangaldai): Sir, I wrote to you this morning about the serious situation that has arisen in Gauhati as a result of (Interruptions)

**MR. SPEAKER:** I thought he was saying something about UP.

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** About UP we made our position quite clear. We call this an arbitrary decision. Besides that, I have written to you this morning about the serious situation arising in Gaubati due to some army men beating two journalists. I have received scores of telegrams on that account. Therefore, I want this matter to be discussed in the House. At least, let the Defence Minister make a statement. There is a lot of tension in Assam, which is a border State, because of this incident. The relationship between the army and the civilian population there was very cordial and by the activities

of a handful of army men the fair name of the Indian army must not be allowed to be tarnished. Therefore, I want something to be done.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have received about a dozen adjournment motions on various subjects and yesterday I received 126 Calling Attention Notices; I counted them yesterday. If the hon. Members want all of them to be taken up in the House, I wonder whether any other business could be taken up in the House.

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** Sir, I wrote to you on this important matter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I know it is important. But, then I have received half a dozen adjournment motions and 126 calling attention notices, some of them about strikes, bus accidents and so on, all types of things. If hon. Members would like to take up all of them here, I do not think we will get time to pass even one Demand.

**SHRI HEM BARUA:** That shows how active and alert Members are.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I am very glad about it. I want members to be very active and attentive. I did discuss this issue about UP with hon. Members. Naturally the opposition is excited because the United Front Government goes. Therefore, we agreed to disagree, after discussions. But I thought that he should at least be allowed to raise it here. That is why I permitted him to raise it.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE** (Kanpur): What is your specific objection to this?

**SHRI P. K. DEO** (Kalahandi): While discussing the various Demands we get an opportunity very often to censure the government. But this is a very unexpected development. We never anticipated that such a situation will arise there. Secondly, this is a matter of urgent public importance which has been agitating the minds of everybody. The SVD Government continued to function there; it did not lose the majority in the House. Because of some internal quarrel, they wanted to change the leadership. Taking advantage of that situation, the Central Government

[Shri P. K. Deo]

have intervened and exercised their extraordinary powers to dissolve the Assembly. Under these circumstances, I feel that there could not be a more appropriate occasion to censure the government by an adjournment motion than this. So, this should be allowed. We may sit longer hours to make up the time.

MR. SPEAKER: As I have said earlier, I have discussed the matter and taken a decision earlier. Not that I am taking a decision now. I have discussed it with Shri Vajpayee in my chamber and I have taken a decision, after looking in the rules and all that. A specific proclamation about UP is coming before the House.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: We want to censure the government now.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think a delay of a few days is going to be very dangerous any way. The Proclamation will be placed before the House in a few minutes and I am sure the Home Minister will agree to an early discussion of that. The BAC will consider the matter and allot time in a day or two.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Why not we have the discussion tomorrow?

MR. SPEAKER: I will fix up the time. This will be considered in the BAC and the Home Minister will also be consulted.

If it is necessary, we shall have it tomorrow.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Why should you consult the Home Minister? He has done his job.

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam): With regard to the Proclamation, it is the privilege of the Opposition to be consulted to fix the time.

MR. SPEAKER: That is all right. Anyway, I am glad that my hon. friend, Shri Deo, is also supporting that there should be an adjournment motion. But I read in the press that his party has dissociated itself.....(Interruption). But I am not interested in it. Government will say

that that is the reason for the Proclamation, that is, because they also decided not to support them.

12.31 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### Performance Budgets of Selected Organisations—1968-69

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): I beg to lay on the Table, in pursuance of an assurance given on the 14th December, 1967, in answer to Unstarred Question No. 4398, a copy of the 'Performance Budgets of Selected Organisations—1968-69' (Hindi and English versions). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-869, 68]

##### Bharat Heavy Electricals and Triveni Structural—Government Reviews and Annual Reports

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): Sir, on behalf of Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed,

I beg to lay on the Table:—

- (1) (i) Review by the Government on the working of the Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1966-67, under sub-section (1) of section 619 A of the Companies Act, 1956.
- (ii) A copy of the Annual Report of the Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1966-67 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon. [Placed in Library See No. LT-870/68].
- (2) (i) Review by the Government on the working of the Triveni Structural Limited, New Delhi for the year 1966-67, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956.