

[Shri D. R. Chavan]

- Delimitation Commission's Order No. 9 dated the 16th September, 1965, relating to the State of Madras.
- (x) Order No. 16E published in Notification No. S. O. 3956 in Gazette of India dated the 22nd December, 1966, making certain corrections in the Delimitation Commission's Order No. 16 dated the 9th February, 1966, relating to the State of West Bengal
- (xi) Order No. 12B published in Notification No. S. O. 3962 in Gazette of India dated the 24th December, 1966, making certain corrections in the Delimitation Commission's Order No. 12 dated the 16th September, 1965, relating to the State of Orissa.
- (xii) Order No. 12C published in Notification No. S. O. 139 in Gazette of India dated the 9th January, 1967, making certain corrections in the Delimitation Commission's Order No. 12 dated the 16th September, 1965, relating to the State of Orissa.
- (xiii) Order No. 11A published in Notification No. S. O. 140 in Gazette of India dated the 9th January, 1967, making certain corrections in the Delimitation Commission's Order No. 11 dated the 25th November, 1965, relating to the State of Mysore.
- (xiv) Order No. 9D published in Notification No. S. O. 141 in Gazette of India dated the 9th January, 1967, making certain corrections in the Delimitation Commission's Order No. 9 dated the 16th September, 1965, relating to the State of Madras.
- (xv) Order No. 27A published in Notification No. S. O. 142 in Gazette of India dated the 9th January, 1967, making certain corrections in the Delimitation Commission's Order No. 22 dated the 15th June, 1966, relating to the Union Territory of Tripura.
- (xvi) Order No. 9E published in Notification No. S. O. 288 in Gazette of India dated the 19th January, 1967, making certain corrections in the Delimitation Commission's Order No. 9 dated the 16th December, 1965, relating to the State of Madras.
- (xvii) Order No. 3A published in Notification No. S. O. 355 in Gazette of India dated the 28th January, 1967, making certain amendments in the Delimitation Commission's Order No. 3 dated the 3rd July, 1965, relating to the State of Andhra Pradesh.
- (xviii) Order No. 11B published in Notification No. S. O. 361 in Gazette of India dated the 31st January, 1967, making certain corrections in the Delimitation Commission's Order No. 11 dated the 25th November, 1965, relating to the State of Mysore.

[Placed in the Library. See No. LT-203/67]

12.41 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 3rd April, 1967 agreed

without any amendment to the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Continuance Bill, 1967, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 29th March, 1967."

12.41½ hrs.

**MOTION OF THANKS ON THE
PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—contd.**

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the motion of thanks on the President's Address. Shri C. C. Desai will continue his speech.

Shri C. C. Desai (Sabarkantha): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when we rose yesterday I was on the subject of Rajasthan and the attitude of the Government thereto. It is a subject which is practically dead. It is like flogging a dead horse. In another ten days the Congress Governor of Rajasthan will be making his trip. I suppose, to Lucknow. He will be going there, as the expression goes, unwept, unsung, unhonoured. That would be the fate of the Governor of Rajasthan.

But there are two subjects about this episode to which I wish to refer on the floor of this House. The opposite side said with thumping of the tables on the other side of the House that we were taking this dispute to the streets. Who took the dispute to the streets? We wanted to take it to the floor of the House. It was Shri Sampurnanand who promulgated the President's Order on the 14th March and who prevented us from taking this dispute to the floor of the House. It was Shri Sampurnanand, it was Shri Sukhadia and their officers who shot down people in the streets of Jaipur and who were responsible for taking this dispute to the streets. Fancy, accusing Maharani Gayatri Devi or Maharawal Lakshman Singh of Dungapur, people of noble birth,

of taking anything to the streets! On the other side there is the pair of Shri Sampurnanand and Shri Sukhadia. I leave it to the House to judge between these two parties as to who could take this particular dispute to the streets.

This takes me to the main question of my speech, namely, the constitutional relationship between the President, the Council of Ministers, the State Governors and the Chief Ministers of States. In the days of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who was a dominating personality, a myth was built up that it was incumbent and mandatory on the President to accept the aid and advice tendered by the Council of Ministers. The President was thus reduced to a figurehead, was reduced to the position of a hereditary monarch.

Shri M. E. Masani (Rajkot):
Shame

Shri C. C. Desai: Whereas our President is an elected person, much more like the American President, not elected as the leader of the front bench opposite to a caucus of 250 people sitting on the opposite side but elected by the entire body of legislators of the country and, therefore, is in a much more representative capacity than the Prime Minister of the country. He is the head of the State. He is the Supreme Commander of armed forces and we cannot be a party to any act on the part of the Government to reduce his extra character and his extra dimensions or to reduce him to the position of a figurehead.

Be it what it may it may have happened in the past, but a new situation has occurred in which it is necessary to rehabilitate and to resuscitate the correct constitutional position of the President. He must not be required either to accept or even to seek the advice of the Council of Ministers in those matters which relate to the Constitution and where impartiality and divorce from