

12.43 hrs.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

We also talk very much about nationalisation of so many things. I am not opposed to nationalisation but what I am opposed to is lest there might be State monopoly. As we are opposed to any sort of monopoly, a State monopoly will be a further worse affair and this will lead us to further trouble. So, instead of creating some condition, which we cannot possibly create, we may create disharmony in the psychology of the people. So, it is our duty not to speak about that and we should create a psychological climate so that people may have confidence in themselves.

Mr. Speaker: Please conclude.

Shri Shashi Ranjan: I am concluding.

There is one more aspect which occurs to me at the moment. The Government can help by reducing taxes on road transport. Road transport very much weighs on us because at present there is an enormous burden of taxation on road transport either by way of petrol or by way of vehicles or by way of tyres and tubes and other things. Whatever is there, the road transport is very much burdened if we try to reduce this burden, this will also help in reducing the prices of commodities and also in employing more people. I request that something must be done to help the road transport.

Then, as I requested the Finance Minister in our party meeting also about the dissolution of monopolies and the dissolution of concentration of wealth in the hands of a few individuals, I again request him that unless and until the monopoly in a particular commodity either with an individual or a group of individuals is not dissolved, except to the barest requirement which our economy can

bear, this country cannot improve economically and so is the case with the concentration of wealth. In other developed countries we notice that only a very minor percentage of economic concentration is allowed to continue in the hands of either an individual or a group of individuals. Here, also, as compared to the per capita income, it should be seen what should be percentage of economic concentration that should be allowed. There is a great imbalance in that concentration of wealth. I again request the Finance Minister to see that the monopolies in particular commodities and the concentration of wealth are dissolved except in proportion that is suited to our country. That is the need of the hour.

12.47 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED INCORRECT STATEMENT BY THE
HOME MINISTER RE. M.P.
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Mr. Speaker: We now take up the privilege Motion, Shri Goel.

Shri Shri Chand Goel (Chandigarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to raise a question of privilege in this House regarding the statement which the hon. Home Minister made in the House on 20th July while speaking on Madhya Pradesh incident.

I wish to remind the House that when the House insisted and was anxious to get information regarding that incident from the Home Minister, the Home Minister suggested that he had had no talk with the Governor. and, therefore, he could not enlighten the House and, in fact, he took time and it was in the evening that he made a statement thereby trying to say that he had had no conversation or talk with the Governor. On the other hand, the statement of the Governor which has appeared in a section of the press, specially in the *Times of India* and the *Hindustan Times*

reveals that the Governor had consulted the Central Government and, I presume, that he had consulted the Home Minister and that, it was at the advice or at the instance of the Home Minister, that he had taken the decision to prorogue the Assembly.

I would like to read a relevant portion of the statement of the Home Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Everybody has read it; that was made on the floor of the House.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: Only one paragraph I want to read:

"About what has happened since yesterday and today, I would like to correct Mr. Madhu Limaye if he wants to be corrected. There are some members who are in the habit of making wild charges. He used the word

स्वांग किया मैंने I said "प्रहस्य"

I would like to repeat what I said this morning. When the question was raised about the prorogation of the Assembly, I said, "I have no facts about it. Unless I get the facts from the Governor, how can I say anything?" Till I talk to the Governor this evening, after I promised to this House to talk to him, I had not a word with the Governor in the last many weeks perhaps. There was no question of giving any direction to the Government. Certainly, I had a talk with the Chief Minister yesterday."

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): What is the statement of the Governor?

Shri Shri Chand Goel: The Home Minister said that he had absolutely no talk with the Governor. Here, I am quoting from the *Hindustan Times* of 21st July on the political crisis in M.P. About the statement of the Governor, Shri K. C. Reddy:

"Asked if he had prorogued the Assembly on the advice of the Chief Minister, Mr Reddy remarked, 'what transpires between me and the Chief Minister is not generally to be disclosed'. He added, he had consulted the Central Government to the extent that the Constitution requires."

Shri Randhir Singh: It does not say, the Home Minister.

श्री बाबू करनमोदीज (बम्बई-दक्षिण): क्या वह कामर्स मिनिस्टर या कैबिनी म्यानिज मिनिस्टर से बात करेंगे।

Shri Shri Chand Goel: What else is 'the Central Government'? Even if he had consulted the Minister of State or the Deputy Minister, we are justified in presuming that the Home Minister was in the know of all this. (Interruption). Again in the *Times of India*...

Mr. Speaker: One paper is good enough. He need not repeat it from all the papers.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: This is what has appeared in the *Times of India* of 21st July regarding the statement of the Governor:

"Asked whether he had consulted the Centre before proroguing the House, he said he had done so 'to the extent the Constitution permits'."

Mr. Speaker: He need not repeat the same wording is there.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: From what has appeared in the Press and from the statement which the Home Minister made in this hon. House, it is clear that the Home Minister has tried to mislead the House, has tried to give wrong information . . .

Shri Randhir Singh: It is a surmise.

Shri Shri Chand Goel: . . . deliberately. According to May's Parliamentary Practice:

[Shri Shri Chand Goel]

"The House may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt."

"In 1963, the House resolved that in making a personal statement which contained the words which he later admitted not to be true, a former Member had been guilty of a grave contempt."

This gives reference to Mr. Profumo's case. I want to draw the attention of this hon. House that the British War Secretary had to lose his job, had to resign, because he had made a wrong statement in the House deliberately. Our case is that the hon. Home Minister knew the full facts. He had had a conversation with the Governor and it was at his instance and advice that the Governor of Madhya Pradesh had prorogued the House. Therefore, we feel that this contradiction between what the Home Minister says and what the Governor says constitutes a breach of privilege of this House, and there is a *prima facie* case. I have to convince you about two things only, that there is a *prima facie* case and that the matter has been raised at an early opportunity. This matter was raised at an early opportunity.

Mr. Speaker: I have permitted him to raise it. That is all right. He may please sit down.

Mr. Limaye.

श्री जयू लिये (मुंबई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले मैं यह साफ करना चाहता हूँ कि इस बन्त सदन के सामने दो बातें हैं। पहली बात तो यह है कि क्या केन्द्र से सलाह-मस्वरा कर के मध्य प्रदेश विधान सभा का सत्तावसान करने का काम हुआ है या नहीं। और केन्द्र से मतलब है सभी मंत्री। गृह मंत्री, या उन के किसी दूत या जासूस किसी व्यक्ति से मुझे कोई मतलब नहीं है। मैं उस

मामले में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। केन्द्र से मतलब है केन्द्रीय सरकार।

श्री रणवीर सिंह : जासूस का क्या मतलब है ?

श्री जयू लिये : आप।

श्री जयू लिये : मुझे पता नहीं कि माननीय मंत्री गवर्नर के साथ कैसे रिश्ते रखते हैं। गृह मंत्री ने अपना कोई दूत भेजा हो या कोई जासूस भेजा हो मुझे उस से मतलब नहीं है। मेरा मतलब तो केन्द्र या केन्द्रीय सरकार से है। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या इस मामले में उस के साथ सलाह-मस्वरा हुआ है या नहीं। आप को यह देखना है कि गवर्नर साहब ने केवल यही नहीं कहा कि सत्तावसान करने में पहले मैं ने संविधान के दायरे में सलाह मस्वरा किया था। उन का यह वाक्य कई जगह धाया है। केवल दिल्ली के समाचारपत्रों में यह वाक्य धाया है, ऐसी बात भी नहीं है। मैं आज हितवाच ले कर धाया हूँ। उस का स्टाफ रिपोर्टर भी यही बात कहता है।

गवर्नर साहब का दूसरा वाक्य यह है, जो कि इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में धाया है, कि मैं ने कब कहा है कि मैं ने मुख्य मंत्री की सलाह मानी थी, मुख्य मंत्री तो मुझे विधान सभा को बरखास्त करने, विसाख करने की सलाह दे रहे थे, लेकिन मैं ने उस को नहीं माना। हितवाच के अनुसार गवर्नर साहब कहते हैं :

"Shri K. C. Reddy said that as the Governor he had to take an objective and dispassionate view of the situation. He was confident that today's step would help maintain the stability of the Government."

उन्होंने कहा है कि गवर्नर के नाते मुझे स्थिति को एक बस्तु-निष्ठ दृष्टिकोण से देखना पड़ता है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि

स्थिति को वस्तु-निष्ठ दृष्टिकोण से बही-
भाषनी देखा सकता है, जो अपने विवेक (डिस्क्रि-
जन) का इस्तेमाल करता है। अगर गवर्नर
साहब को केवल मुख्य मंत्री की सलाह पर
काम करना था तो वह इस तरह का वाक्य
कभी न कहते कि मैं ने वस्तु-निष्ठ दृष्टिकोण
से स्थिति का अध्ययन किया।

'इंडियन एक्सप्रेस' में गवर्नर साहब ने
कहा कि मैं ने बिरोधी दल वालों से भी सलाह-
मशवरा किया और मुख्य मंत्री से भी सलाह-
मशवरा किया मैं ने मुख्य मंत्री की सलाह को
नहीं माना, उन्हो ने मुझे विधान सभा का
दरखास्त करने की सलाह दी, लेकिन मैं न
सलाहमान करने का फैसला किया।

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नर
साहब जो यहाँ आए थे, दो तीन रोज रहें,
तो वह काहे के लिए यहाँ आए थे। अगर वह
केवल कास्टीट्यूशनल हैड हैं, तो उन को गोपाल
में बैठना चाहिए। मैं नहीं कहता कि इन
लोगों ने श्री मिश्र से क्यों बात की, क्योंकि
ये सांग वकिंग कमेटी या पार्टी के स्तर पर
मुख्य मंत्री से बात करते हैं और इन का प्रापस
में सलाह-मशवरा होता है। इसलिये मैं उस में
नहीं पड़ता हूँ। लेकिन क्या गवर्नर साहब
कांग्रेस पार्टी से मशवरा करने के लिये आए
थे? उन को तो केन्द्र से नहीं, मुख्य मंत्री ही
से सलाह-मशवरा करना है। इस से प्रकट है
कि इस बारे में गवर्नर साहब के साथ सलाह-
मशवरा हो रहा है।

श्री शशिरजन (परी) क्या गवर्नर
साहब के लिए दिल्ली जाने का दरवाजा बन्द
है?

श्री मधु लियव : मैं उन के यहाँ जाने
को बन्द करने की चर्चा नहीं कर रहा हूँ।
मैं तो यह बता रहा हूँ कि वास्तविक घटना
क्या हुई है। मैं तो बुक से ही कह रहा हूँ कि
इन का गवर्नर साहब के साथ सलाह-मशवरा
हुआ है। वह मशवरा करना नहीं चाहिए,

मैं यह भी नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मैं तो यह कहना
चाहता हूँ कि अगर सलाह-मशवरा हुआ है,
तो इन बातों को छिपाया क्यों जाता है?
सरकार खुल कर कहे कि हमारी सलाह से
सलाहमान किया गया। मैं फिर कहूँ कि
सलाहमान जिस स्थिति में हुआ है, उस से
सविधान के अनुच्छेद 203, 164 और 353
की हत्या हुई है। यह सविधान के खिलाफ
काम हुआ है।

श्री शशिरजन माननीय सदस्य अनुच्छेद
356 को भी देखें।

श्री मधु लियव अनुच्छेद 356 का
मतलब यह होता है कि राज्य की सरकार
सविधान के अनुसार नहीं चलाई जा सकती है
और गवर्नर उस के बारे में रपट भेजता है।
मैं उस की चर्चा कहा कर रहा हूँ? इस अनुच्छेद
के मातहत कोई रपट भी नहीं आई है (व्यव-
धान) मुझे माननीय सदस्यों के टोकने पर
कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। मैं उन की बातों का
जवाब दूँगा। अनुच्छेद 356 बिल्कुल अलग
है। (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker. By these interrup-
tions and running commentaries the
hon Member is not helping the debate
but only lengthening it because Shri
Madhu Limaye will begin replying to
him every time

श्री मधु लियव अभी हिन्दू में वह खबर
आई है।

"The Union Home Secretary is
understood to have sounded the
State Government Chief Secre-
tary today as to how soon he could
hold mid-term elections in
Madhya Pradesh if it was decid-
ed to hold them Mr Noronha,
Chief Secretary, is understood to
have replied that they could not
be held before mid-November.
'Elections were out of the ques-

[श्री मधु निमवे]

tion during the monsoon and the time before November would be the minimum required for making the necessary preparations, he is reported to have told the Home Secretary."

केन्द्र का गृह सचिव मध्य प्रदेश के मुख्य सचिव के साथ इन बारे में चर्चा कर रहा है कि ये मध्यावधि चुनाव कब किये जायेंगे, क्या उन को नवम्बर में करना सम्भव होगा, आदि। केन्द्र और प्रदेश सरकार के बीच में इस मामले पर यहां तक बातचीत चल रही है। यह कोई कांग्रेस पार्टी का मामला नहीं है। केन्द्र के होम सेक्रेटरी और राज्य के चीफ सेक्रेटरी के बीच में बातचीत चल रही है।

'टाइम्स आफ इण्डिया' ने यह खबर आई है कि कांग्रेस पार्लियामेंटरी बोर्ड की बैठक में श्री चट्टाच ने श्री मिश्र के द्वारा गवर्नर को लिखे गए पत्र का हवाला दिया। हो सकता है कि यह सच हो, लेकिन उस का तो खुलासा यह कर सकते हैं।

यदि सलाहसाल के पहले गवर्नर को कोई बिट्टी मिश्र जी ने लिखी है तो वह बिट्टी और मेरे प्रस्ताव के अबाध में आपने कहा कि गवर्नर से हम जानकारी हासिल करेंगे। तो उन का जो जवाब आया होगा या उन के सेक्रेटरी का आया होगा, वह पूरा सदन के पटल पर रखा जाय। अभी फैसला आप न दीजिए। गृह मंत्री जी का खुलासा भी आप बुनिए। जो सारी बातें आप के सामने हैं उन को देखते हुए मैं एक ही सवाल आप के मार्फत सदन से करना चाहता हूँ कि क्या सचमुच आप लोगों का विश्वास है कि इतने बड़े मामले में केन्द्र सरकार से, किसी से भी, प्रस्ताव मंत्री हों, गृह मंत्री हों या और किसी से हो, बातचीत किये बिना यह सारा काम किया क्या? अगर आप की इच्छा है कि सचमुच सदन विश्वास करें तो यह बात इच्छा है, मैं तो कर नहीं सकता।

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): The points raised by the hon. Member, Shri Goel, relate to what I said in the House the other day that I had not talked to the Governor before I asked him after I was asked by the Lok Sabha to find out the reasons and the facts of the prorogation of the Assembly. I do stand by what I had uttered in this House that I did not have any discussion, any talk, with the Governor before that. So there was no question of my advising him or there being any discussion between him and me.

13 hrs.

As regards what the Governor is reported to have said to the pressmen, naturally I wanted to find out when the privilege motion was raised here. The letter* received from his Secretary—I am prepared to lay it on the Table—to one of the Joint Secretaries in the Home Ministry reads thus.

"My dear Srinivasavardhan,

"I have received your d.o. letter no. . . dated 22 July with the enclosed copy of a privilege motion, notice of which has been given in the Lok Sabha by Shri Madhu Lamaye, MP and others.

"I have placed the papers before the Governor and he desires me to say that the reports quoted in the motion that have appeared in two Delhi papers are incorrect. Some representatives of the press met the Governor on 20th July. He handed to them a prepared statement, a copy of which is enclosed.

"One of the representatives asked him whether in arriving at his decision to prorogue the Assembly he had consulted the Centre. The Governor replied: "I consult the Centre to the extent the Constitution permits". What

he meant to say was that it was only where the Constitution requires it that he consults the Centre in this particular case, such a consultation was neither required nor permitted, and no advice was given by the Centre. He took the decision on the advice of the Chief Minister.

'As for the report quoted from the *Indian Express*, he made no reference whatever to dissolution as it did not arise then. No advice has been received by the Governor from the Chief Minister about dissolution hitherto. The advice was only in respect of prorogation of the Assembly.

'The report that he had taken this decision on his own after hearing both the Chief Minister and the Leader of the Opposition is also not correct. He told them that he had met the Chief Minister and the Leader and a few other members of the Opposition earlier on the 19th July. The decision taken by him on the 20th July was based on the advice received on 20th July through a letter from the Chief Minister.'

These are the facts. He again mentioned what is reported to have transpired between the Home Secretary here and the Chief Secretary there. That matter does not come in here.

Mr. Speaker: No we are concerned only with the matter raised originally by Shri Goel.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: These are the two things: whether I or anybody else from the Centre talked to the Governor, and gave advice. I stand by my statement and this is the explanation of the Governor. There is no discrepancy between what the Governor has to say and what I said. So I plead that there is no *prima facie* case for privilege.

Shri S. M. Bamerjee rose—

Mr. Speaker: I do not think any further discussion is necessary. It is clear that the Governor himself has said that he has not consulted the Home Minister.

Shri K. K. Nayar (Bahraich): The Governor has not stated, his Secretary has stated.

Mr. Speaker: The Home Minister also agrees and says that he stands by what he has stated. In view of the fact that the Governor also corroborates this, that he has not consulted the Home Minister, I do not think there is any case made out. I therefore withhold my consent to this motion.

We shall now adjourn for lunch to meet again at 2 P.M.

13.05 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the clock.

The Lok Sabha reassembled after Lunch at three minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

FINANCE (NO. 2) BILL, 1967—
Contd.

Shri K. K. Nayar (Bahraich): I rise to oppose the Finance Bill and to make some observations on the fiscal policy and practices of the Government of India. Many distinguished members of this House have already made topical comment on various aspects of the policy in the course of the discussion of the budget. I wish to say something about the unreality of the concepts and beliefs on which the policy is based. If, in the course of my observations, I utter some home truths which may appear pungent or unpalatable to my friends on the Congress benches, I would request them to bear with me.