

12 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF
URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCEREPORTED STATEMENT BY SPOKESMAN OF
HOME MINISTRY Re. HARYANA

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अविलम्बनीय लोक-महत्व के निम्नलिखित विषय की और माननीय गृह-मन्त्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वे इस सम्बन्ध में एक वक्तव्य दें :

“गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय के प्रवक्ता द्वारा दिये गये कथित वक्तव्य और आकाश-वाणी द्वारा 10 दिसम्बर, 1968 को किये गये प्रसारण कि हरियाणा के मुख्य मन्त्री को, जिनका विधान सभा में बहुमत नहीं रहा, राज्यपाल को यह परामर्श देने का अधिकार है कि वह राज्य विधान सभा का विघटन करें।”

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I had no occasion to make any statement to the Press on the developments in Haryana last week. I had explained more than once in this House that except in certain specific situations, the Governor of a State has to function as a constitutional Head and act on the aid and advice of his Council of Ministers. The reports attributed to official circles in regard to Haryana developments appear to be based on inferences drawn from my observations on the constitutional position of Governors. (Interruptions) . . .

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): This question has become obsolete. It has become a dead letter.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उस दिन जब हरियाणा का मामला सदन में उठा था तो आपने कहा था कि बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी विचार करेगी। वहाँ यह तय हुआ कि यह कास अटैन्शन से लिया जाए। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि इस पर प्रश्न पूछने और

अपनी बात कहने की पूरी इजाजत दी जाए। यह मामला बड़ा गम्भीर है, इसमें केन्द्रीय सरकार, गृह मन्त्री और गृह मन्त्रालय तथा राज्यपाल का आचरण जुड़ा हुआ है और इसको मैं दो भागों में बाटता हूँ। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री रणधीर सिंह : वहाँ की सरकार बड़ी तगड़ी है। सभी को पछाड़ कर रख दिया है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सरकार तगड़ी है या कमजोर है, यह सवाल नहीं है। मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि क्या गृह-मंत्रालय के किसी प्रवक्ता ने 10 दिसम्बर को समाचार-पत्रों में, जिसमें भाल इंडिया रेडियो भी शामिल है, यह कहा या नहीं कहा कि अगर हरियाणा के मुख्य मंत्री राज्यपाल को यह सलाह देना चाहें कि विधान सभा को भंग कर दिया जाए, तो राज्यपाल उस सलाह को मानने के लिए बाध्य होंगे? मुझे ताज्जुब है कि गृह-मन्त्री इससे इनकार कर रहे हैं। मैंने अपनी ध्यान-प्राकर्षण सूचना में—स्पोट्स् भंग आफ बि होम मिनिस्ट्री—लिखा है और मैं इस बात को साबित करने के लिए भी तैयार हूँ। आप इस सारे मामले को प्रिविलेज कमेटी के पास भेज दीजिए, मैं साबित करने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि होम मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से ब्रीफ किया गया। भाल इंडिया रेडियो पर आखिर खबर कैसे गई? भाल इंडिया रेडियो सरकार द्वारा संचालित है। क्या गृह-मन्त्रालय के प्रवक्ता के नाम से भाल इंडिया रेडियो ऐसी कोई खबर प्रसारित कर सकता है जो कि गृह-मंत्रालय से न दी गई हो अगर गृह-मन्त्री इससे इनकार कर रहे हैं तो यह बड़ा गम्भीर मामला है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, 9 दिसम्बर को जब हरियाणा की विधान सभा के 41 सदस्यों ने स्वयं को राज्यपाल के सामने पेश किया और उन्हें 42 सदस्यों का स्मृति-पत्र दिया, उस समय यह स्पष्ट हो गया कि हरियाणा

[श्री भटल बिहारी बाजपेयी]

की विधान सभा में बंशीलाल मंत्री-मंडल का बहुमत नहीं है। 10 तारीख को यह मामला हम ने सदन में उठाया तब स्पीकर महोदय ने यह कहा कि विधान सभा में किसका बहुमत है, इसका निर्णय विधान सभा में ही होना चाहिए और सात दिन के भीतर विधान सभा की बैठक बुलानी चाहिए। स्पीकर महोदय द्वारा, विधान मंडलों के अध्यक्षों द्वारा किए गए निर्णयों का उल्लेख करने के बाद गृह-मंत्री और गृह-मन्त्रालय की सारी ताकत इस बात पर लगनी चाहिए थी—नैतिक या जिस प्रकार से भी वे काम करते हैं—कि वहाँ के राज्यपाल से कहा जाता कि वे हरियाणा विधान सभा की बैठक बुलायें ताकि उसमें शक्ति परीक्षण हो सके। लेकिन वैसा करने के बजाय गृह-मंत्री इनकार कर रहे हैं। मैं यहाँ पर स्टेट्समैन का एक उद्धरण देना चाहता हूँ :

“Bansilal is within his rights to advise the dissolution—Chavan”.

यह खबर चव्हाण साहब के नाम से स्टेट्समैन में छपी है लेकिन वे इससे इनकार करते हैं। परन्तु प्रवक्ता ने यह बात कही, इससे इनकार नहीं कर सकते हैं। आप इसकी जांच करवाइये, मैं साबित करने के लिए तैयार हूँ कि यह बात प्रवक्ता द्वारा कही गई या नहीं कही गई। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि गृह-मंत्री द्वारा अपने प्रभाव का उपयोग करके विधान सभा की बैठक बुलवाने के बजाए, गृह-मन्त्रालय की तरफ से यह कह दिया गया कि जिस मुख्य मंत्री का बहुमत समाप्त हो गया है, या कम से कम जिस मुख्य मंत्री का बहुमत सन्देह में पड़ गया हो, उसे विधान सभा को भंग करवाने का अधिकार है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या गृहमंत्री इस मापदंड को और राज्यों में भी लागू करने के लिए तैयार हैं? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि पंजाब के संयुक्त मोर्चे की सरकार में जब कांग्रेस बल के प्रयत्नों से फूट पड़ गई और वहाँ के मुख्य मंत्री श्री गुरनाम सिंह ने राज्य-

पाल से कहा कि आप विधान सभा भंग कर दीजिए, पंजाब की जनता स्वयं तय करे कि किस की सरकार बने तो राज्यपाल महोदय ने उनको नहीं माना? पश्चिम बंगाल में राज्यपाल ने कौन सी नीति अपनाई, उसको यहाँ पर दोहराने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि प्रवक्ता ने जो यह कहा था, उसके सम्बन्ध में क्या केन्द्रीय मंत्री-मंडल ने कोई फैसला किया है कि अगर किसी मुख्य मंत्री का बहुमत सन्देह में पड़ जाए तो उसको अधिकार होगा . . . (व्यवधान) . .

अगर इस तरह से टीका-टिप्पणी होगी तो उसका उत्तर देना हम भी जानते हैं। मैं यहाँ पर एक बड़े सिद्धांत का प्रश्न खड़ा कर रहा हूँ। ऐसी बात फिर केवल एक राज्य पर या एक दल पर ही लागू नहीं होगी बल्कि सारे देश के लिए आपको कुछ परंपरायें विकसित करनी पड़ेंगी। क्या राज्यपाल भ्रम-भ्रमण मापदंडों से कार्य करेंगे? क्या गृह-मन्त्रालय, जहाँ पर कोई कांग्रेसी सरकार लड़-खड़ा रही हो, वहाँ पर विधान सभा को भंग करने की धमकी देगा? हरियाणा में क्या हुआ? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप देखिये कि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल किस तरीके से आचरण कर रहे हैं? 9 तारीख को जब 41 विधान सभा के सदस्य उनको मिले तो राज्यपाल ने उनकी गिनती करने की तकलीफ गवारा नहीं की। बाद में उन्होंने पत्रकारों से कहा कि मुझे नहीं मालूम कि वह कितने थे लेकिन बाद में जब मुख्य मंत्री बंशीलाल राज्यपाल से मिले तो राज्यपाल ने कहा कि उन्हें इसका विश्वास हो गया है कि मुख्य मंत्री बंशीलाल के साथ बहुमत है। राज्यपाल ने यह भी कहा कि 6 इंडिपेंडेंट लोगों का भी समर्थन मुख्य मंत्री बंशीलाल को प्राप्त है। जब पत्रकारों ने राज्यपाल से पूछा कि उन इंडिपेंडेंट मेम्बरों के नाम बतलाइये तो राज्यपाल ने इंकार कर दिया। क्या राज्यपाल मनमाने ढंग से आचरण करेंगे? क्या गृह-मन्त्रालय बसबंदी के

भाषार पर संविधान के महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्नों का निर्णय करेगा ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि गृह-मंत्रालय इन प्रश्नों का जवाब दे और उनको टालें नहीं।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I do not know what he has asked. He has expressed his views. I cannot help it. One can only interpret the constitutional provisions. The Central Government had no occasion to take any view in this matter, because it is not the function of the Central Government to take a view. The Central Government, as the executive, does not interpret the Constitution.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Then how did the spokesman of the Home Ministry come into the picture?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: As Home Minister, on the floor of the House I had expressed certain views when we were debating the Madhya Pradesh problem here. I have some extracts of what I said at that time. I had said:

"The Governor of a State is a Constitutional Head except in regard to three articles. I have referred to the latest scholarly edition of the Constitution by Mr. Seervai, the Advocate General of Maharashtra. He has said that only under three articles, the Governor of a State functions as an agent of the President. They are articles 239(2), 200 and 356. Except in regard to these articles, the Governor functions as the Constitutional Head."

I had also said:

"When an advice is given, by the Chief Minister to the Governor, the question is whether the Governor is bound by the advice or not. My answer to that is, he is bound to accept the advice."

I had expressed these views when we discussed the Madhya Pradesh situation. When a certain situation arises, if anybody tried to interpret my views . . .

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Who is anybody?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I have got the extract of what the All India Radio announcement said. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Lay it on the Table.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I did not refer to the All India Radio first. It was Mr. Vajpayee who did and it is for him to lay it on the Table. Now, Sir, in the AIR announcement, the word used is not "official spokesman" but "official circles".

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What is the difference?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: There is a lot of difference. Official circles can interpret what I said before. What is wrong in that?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: That means, you accept the responsibility.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: In this particular situation developing in Haryana, that was a matter between the Governor, the Chief Minister and the legislature there. What are we supposed to do in this matter? Even if certain official circles of the Home Ministry interpret what I said before, I cannot help it.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: मेरे द्वारा किये गये सवालों का जवाब नहीं आया। मैंने पूछा था कि यह जो गृह-मंत्री महोदय ने विचार प्रकट किया है कि जिस मुख्य मंत्री का बहुमत संदेह में पड़ गया हो उसे राज्यपाल को विधानसभा को भंग करने की सलाह देने का अधिकार होगा। यह मुख्य मंत्री का विचार गृह-मंत्री महोदय का है या यह डिफेंकेंस के लिए जो कमेटी बनी है उसका है या यह सारे मंत्रिमंडल का विचार है? मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि कैबिनेट की पालिसी क्या है?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: It is not the question of the Cabinet taking any policy decision in the matter. That is exactly where the hon. Member is misreading the Constitution and the functioning of a Governor and of Government. What a Governor should do in a Constitutional situation in a State

[Y. B. Chavan]

is none of the business of the Central Government.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। गृह-मंत्री महोदय परस्पर विरोधी बातें कह रहे हैं। वह कह रहे हैं कि राज्यपाल क्या करे या क्या न करे उसे हमको यह कहने का अधिकार नहीं है लेकिन उन्होंने यह कह दिया कि हरियाणा के राज्यपाल मुख्य मंत्री की सलाह मानने के लिए बंधे हुए हैं। यह बात यहां दिल्ली से कैसे कही गयी? मैं इसके लिए हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स को कोट कर रहा हूँ :

"Official circles said today".

गृह-मंत्री महोदय का यह विचार कि प्राल इंडिया रेडियो ने आफिशिएल स्पोकस-मैन नहीं कहा बल्कि आफिशिएल सर्किल्स कहा इसलिए उसमें फर्क हो जाता है यह तर्क मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। 10 तारीख को जबकि हरियाणा में उदलपुथल हो रही थी और यहां पर मामला उठाया गया था तो डा० संजीव रेड्डी ने यह निदेश दिया था कि 7 दिन के अन्दर हरियाणा विधान सभा की बैठक बुलाई जानी चाहिए लेकिन उसके लिए राज्यपाल ने कुछ नहीं किया लेकिन इसके दूसरी ओर राज्यपाल को सलाह यहां से दी जाती है कि अगर बंसीलाल उन्हें कहें कि विधान सभा को भंग कर दिया जाय तो वह उसे मानने के लिए मजबूर हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या अन्य राज्य-पालों को भी इस तरह के निदेश दिये जायेंगे? मेरे इस प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं दिया गया है। जब पंजाब में गुरुनाम सिंह ने राज्यपाल से चाहा कि वह विधान सभा को भंग कर दें तो राज्यपाल महोदय ने वह उनकी सिफारिश क्यों नहीं मानी? क्या गृह-मंत्री ने उस समय भी यह उन्हें कहा था कि मुख्य मंत्री की बात मानने के लिए राज्यपाल बंधे हुए हैं?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: If I had been asked, I would have repeated the same opinion even then.

श्री रवि राम (पुरी) : दरअसल हमारे गृह-मंत्री महोदय परस्पर विरोधी बात कहने में माहिर हो गये हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब इस तरह का स्टेट्समैन प्रखबार में निकला :

"Bansi Lal within his rights to advice dissolution".

चव्हाण साहब के जरिये ऐसा कहा गया। अगर यह बात नहीं थी तो उस चीज को दूसरे दिन चव्हाण साहब के जरिये या उनके दफ्तर के जरिए उसका खंडन क्यों नहीं किया गया?

गृह-मंत्री महोदय पर संविधान को लागू करने की जिम्मेदारी है। अब हालत यह है कि वह बंगाल के लिए एक बात करते हैं और दूसरे हरियाणा जैसे प्रान्त के लिए उससे विपरीत बात करते हैं। बंगाल और पंजाब आदि के लिए वह एक प्रलग मापदंड निर्धारित करते हैं क्योंकि वहां की गैर-कांग्रेसी सरकारों को हटाना है लेकिन चूंकि हरियाणा में बंसीलाल के मुख्य मंत्रित्व में कांग्रेसी सरकार स्थापित है इसलिए उसके लिए एक दूसरा ही मापदंड वह निर्धारित करते हैं। मैं स्टेट्समैन से एक उद्धरण देना चाहता हूँ :

"The horse-trading that has gone on in Haryana is a dangerous omen".

उसमें कहा गया है :

"If the Central Congress leadership was really interested in the long haul—rather than in Mr. Bansi Lal's immediate survival to save the party's face in these crucial pre-election weeks—it should have acted as sternly against the other defectors as it did with Mr. B. D. Sharma, the ringleader."

मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि जान-बूझ कर प्राल इंडिया रेडियो के जरिए यह कहा गया है कि मुख्य मंत्री इस तरह से कह सकता है। बी० डी० शर्मा को हटा दिया

गया, श्री निर्जिलगप्पा का इशारा था कि वह जाकर एक्सेशन करेंगे कैबिनेट का। अभी 4-5 लोग फिर वापिस आ रहे हैं और यह लोग आगे जाकर मंत्री बनेंगे। अभी आप जानते हैं कि डिफेक्शन कमेटी की रपट है। इस सदन में बाकायदा बहस हुई थी और फिर एक कमेटी बैठाई गई थी जिसकी कि रपट सामने है। उसे एक महिना भी नहीं हुआ और उस रपट के ऊपर इस सदन में बहस भी नहीं हुई और अभी से गृह-मंत्री महोदय संविधान की स्वस्थ परम्परा को तोड़ने में लगे हुए हैं। मैं गृह-मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ कि डिफेक्शन कमेटी में डिस्सोल्यूशन के सिलसिले में कोई विचार-विमर्श हुआ था यदि हुआ था तो क्या यह चीज सामने आई थी कि माइनारिटी में आ गये चीफ मिनिस्टर को डिस्सोल्यूशन करने की राज्यपाल को सलाह देने की इजाजत नहीं दी जायेगी? क्या आप इस चीज को मानते हैं?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The discussions of the Defection Committee are very interesting. Certainly they can be discussed when the report is before us. How can I sum up the views expressed by different members in different ways in a committee? It is very difficult for me to do.

SHRI RANGA (Srikulam): on all the relevant things we were unanimous. The only thing is that in practice we would not behave like that.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: No; there is no question of that. If I remember it aright, the only question that was discussed in the Defection Committee was whether this question of advice for dissolution etc., was germane to the work of the Defection Committee and it was thought that it was not germane to the work of the Committee. That was all that was discussed about it.

श्री रवि राय: मेरे सवाल का जवाब नहीं आया। मैंने पूछा है कि जब कोई चीफ मिनिस्टर माइनारिटी में हो तो क्या उसको राज्यपाल को यह सलाह देने का हक

है कि राज्यपाल विधान सभा को डिजौल्व कर दे? गृह मंत्री महोदय की इस बारे में क्या राय है?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: These are hypothetical questions.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Sir, actually our calling-attention notice was given when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee raised this issue on the basis of a newspaper item wherein there was some announcement from the All India Radio.

[MR. SPEAKER *In the Chair*]

You remember, Sir, when you were in the Chair and this question of Haryana was raised, you in your wisdom said that something should be done within seven days and the Assembly should be called. In your absence that has altogether been flouted. Anyhow, since you are here, I am submitting that the Home Minister in his reply has conveniently not mentioned what was announced by the All India Radio. Unfortunately, sometimes the All India Radio behaves like All Indira Radio. Whatever is announced by Government . . . (Interruption)

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICA-
TIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH):
This is highly objectionable.

MR. SPEAKER: Come to the question. The question is about Haryana and not about All India Radio.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: They have misused the radio.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The hon. Home Minister was talking about the sanctity of Parliament and the Governor's powers according to the Constitution. It is a fact that in Haryana Shri Bansi Lal has lost his majority and, under the guidance of the Centre, is being helped by the Home Minister and the Governor who, unfortunately, has become a partisan in this whole affair. The same rule was not applied which is being applied now, when Shri Ajoy Kumar Mukerjee, wanted to convene the Assembly on the 18th December. Only a few days after that he was forced to convene it before and

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

ultimately that government, elected by the people, was dismissed. In UP the Assembly members came here all the way from Lucknow.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rajasthan.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: They wanted to have a physical check up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Medical check-up.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: They wanted to check them physically. They went to the President but they refused to have even a physical check-up. They refused to count them even and then the Government was dismissed. So I would like to know from the hon. Home Minister as to when he is going to leave these double standards (*An Hon. Member: Never.*), whether he would advise the Governor now to see that the Assembly is convened without delay before this horse-trading ends.

AN HON. MEMBER: Bullock trading.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: It is going on. Everybody is assured that the moment he is elected or comes back to the Congress, he will become a minister. In Haryana all Congress members are going to be ministers.

Why did he not apply the same standard in Bengal and UP and why is he sticking to this now? Is it because here it is a Congress government? We know that Shri Govinda Menon, when he went to America, said something nasty there about United Front governments. Yesterday Shri Morarji Desai said something about the Kerala Government that he would like to dismiss them and so on. That is the policy of the Central Government, to dismiss non-Congress governments and to install Congress governments by hook or by crook. Is that going to be the policy?

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): By crook.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The hon. Member has not asked me a question. He made a charge against me of having double standards.

The question he has to ask himself is whether he is not following double standards. He wants one to be applied to Bengal and another to Haryana.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: That is not the thing.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: That is exactly the thing. The situations in Bengal and Haryana are different. In Bengal the Governor was convinced that the Government was in a minority. Here, in this case, the Governor did not find the Government in a minority.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali): Very conveniently so.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: (South Delhi) When defections began to take place on a large-scale after the General Elections in 1967, many of the Congress Ministries began to fall one after another. A new sense of ethical values, democratic values and democratic norms began to dawn on the Congress leaders who had been encouraging defections for the past 20 years. It was said in the House and outside and the committees began to be appointed as to how these defections can be avoided and how some political health can be restored to the country. Then, a suggestion came from some quarters that one way of preventing defections is that we should give the power to the Chief minister, the Prime Minister, who is threatened by defections or who has lost majority, to dissolve the House. It was suggested that that would prevent the people who want to cross the floor. At that time, it was clearly said in the House and outside—it was discussed in the Committee on Defections also—that this would be a very very dangerous weapon. Some people quoted the British example how it is done there that in Britain there are only two major parties and there too, normally, the advice of the Prime Minister is accepted by the King or Queen only when he is in majority and that, when it is clear that he has lost majority, even if he advises the Crown, the Crown is not bound to accept the advice and the other party is called upon to form the Ministry.

In this country, a number of occasions arose when, because no such practice or no such convention was there, the Governor followed one pattern in Rajasthan,

another pattern in Bihar and a third pattern in West Bengal and so on. Then, you, Sir, convened the Presiding Officers Conference and certain norms were laid that whenever the majority of a party or a Ministry in any legislature was in doubt, what should be done. That Conference suggested that whenever there was a doubt about a Ministry enjoying on majority support, the Assembly should be called within seven days and the decision whether the majority is with the Chief Minister or not should be settled on the floor of the House. This matter came before the Defections Committee also. The majority of the members there opposed giving a blanket right to any Chief Minister when he had lost the majority, to advise the Governor to dissolve the Assembly. One could understand whatever the Chief Minister might have said, whatever the other people might have said, when the norms were not there. But, in view of these norms having been established, I want to know what has been done in Haryana. Why did not the Haryana Chief Minister, advise the Governor, to convene the Assembly within seven days to find out whether the majority was with the Chief Minister or not? This is my charge.

Then, the All India Radio and the press brought out the report, by official circles or the Home Ministry, that the Governor is bound by the advice of the Chief Minister if he wants to dissolve the Assembly. This acted as a threat and, apart from other methods, cajoling and paying money and bribes, this was also used as a means to bring back some of those people. It is this kind of horse-trading that we have been condemning and which the Home Minister has been condemning. That kind of horse-trading was encouraged by the spokesmen of the Home Ministry.

Further, one of the norms established is that there should be a limit to the number of Ministers that any Ministry should have. Now, we find that some steps are being taken to expand the Haryana Ministry. So far, they have not done it. I want to know whether, in the face of the norm that has been established now, such a thing would be justifiable.

My first specific question is whether the All India Radio was given this news by

somebody from the Home Ministry or it was just inferred from the past utterances of the Home Minister and, if somebody gave it to All India Radio, who was the person responsible for it. My second question is whether it is binding for the Governor to accept the advice of the Chief Minister when he has lost the majority in the Assembly. We want a clear mind of the Government in regard to that. I also want to know whether the Government accept the recommendations of the Presiding Officers' Conference that whenever the Chief Minister has lost the majority, the decision should be taken on the floor of the Assembly within seven days. Even now there is a doubt about the majority in the Haryana Assembly. I want to know whether even now they will ask the Governor to call the Assembly so that one should know whether the Chief Minister enjoys the majority or not.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: The hon. Member has raised some questions about the discussions in the Defections Committee. He was a member of the Defections Committee. He knows what he said there.

As far as the ceiling on the Ministries is concerned, this is one of the recommendations which has come. I do not know whether it is right for me to discuss a recommendation of a committee the report of which has yet to come before the House. Unless this report is accepted by the House and unless a certain legislation is passed on the basis of those recommendations, it cannot be said that the norms have been accepted.

SHRI RANGA: It is a unanimous one.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: As far as I am concerned, I am a party to that decision, but this will have to have some sort of a statutory effect. I will be glad if some norm acceptable to all is evolved even without legislation.

Then, the hon. Member raised a question who said what. I did say that possibly some officials, even from the Home Ministry, may have discussed what I said in 1967, and tried to interpret it that way. I am not denying that possibility. I cannot help that. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: I have put three specific questions and I want specific answers for these. The Home Minister is an able Parliamentarian. I hope, he will give answers to those specific questions.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: He asked me specific questions and I have given specific answers.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: Do you accept the recommendations of the Speakers' Conference?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: I respect the Resolutions of the Speakers' Conference, but I have no power to implement them.

SHRI HEM BARUA: May I draw your attention to a very serious matter? This is about conversion of the Birla House in Delhi into a national monument. A fast has been undertaken by Shri Shashi Bhushan . . . *(Interruptions)*

श्री रवि राम (पुरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप इस पर कालिंग एटेंशन नोटिस की इजाजत दीजिए ।

Mr. SPEAKER: Let us see. I have not seen them. I will see. Now, papers to be laid on the Table.

12. 33 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ANNUAL REPORT OF LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATION OF INDIA

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA): On behalf of Shri Morarji Desai,

I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the Life Insurance Corporation of India for the year ended the 31st March, 1968 along with the Audited Accounts, under section 29 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956. *[Placed in Library. See LT-2693/68].*

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER UTTAR PRADESH NAGAR MAHAPALIKA ADHINIYAM (HINDI AND ENGLISH VERSIONS)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH, FAMILY PLANNING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (DR. S. CHANDRASEKHAR): On behalf of Shri Satya Narain Sinha, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following U. P. Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (4) of section 540 of the Uttar Pradesh Nagar Mahapalika Adhiniyam, 1959, read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 25th February, 1968, as varied by Proclamation dated the 15th April, 1968, issued by the President in relation to the State of Uttar Pradesh:—

- (1) The Rules for the Assessment and Collection of Tax on Advertisements, not being Advertisements published in newspapers by the Nagar Mahapalika, Kanpur, published in Notification No. 4313-B/XI-C-31-MT-62 in Uttar Pradesh Gazette dated the 23rd November, 1968.
- (2) The Rules for the Assessment and Collection of Tax on Advertisements, not being Advertisements published in newspapers by the Nagar Mahapalika, Varanasi, published in Notification No. 4345-B/XI-C-56-MT-60 in Uttar Pradesh Gazette dated the 23rd November, 1968.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2694/68].

REPORT OF SMALL FAMILY NORM COMMITTEE

Dr. S. CHANDRASEKHAR: I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report (1968) of Small Family Norm Committee.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2695/68].

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER THE CUSTOMS ACT, CENTRAL EXCISES AND SALT ACT ETC.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C. PANT): I beg to lay on the Table:—

- (1) A copy each of the following Notifications