

local automobile firm at Trivandrum—M/s. Aravind Automobiles—have produced a small car costing about Rs. 9,600 excluding labour charges with all-indigenous material;

(b) if so, whether Government experts have examined the car as to its suitability and design for Indian conditions; and

(c) whether the feasibility or otherwise of manufacturing such cheap cars in the Fourth Plan has been considered?

The Minister of Industry (Shri D. Sanjivayya): (a) Report of such a car has appeared in a daily.

(b) No, but fuller details of the technical specifications of the car and the manner in which it has been assembled are being called for from the firm.

(c) The question of establishment of such a project during the Fourth Five Year Plan in the country is under consideration.

Meals served on Railway Stations

2029. Shri Dasaratha Deb: Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that quality of meals supplied in the restaurants at the Railway Stations and in the trains has recently deteriorated; and

(b) if so, whether Government propose to take steps to improve the quality as well as quantity of the meals served in the trains and the restaurants at the Railway Stations?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): (a) and (b). There have been some complaints in regard to the quality of meals supplied. These have been duly investigated and corrective action taken where necessary to improve the quality. As regards quantity, frequent checks are made to ensure that scheduled quantities are supplied to passengers.

रेलवे कर्मचारियों को रात में काम करने के लिए भत्ता

2030. डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :

श्री प्रधु लिमये :

श्री किशन पटनायक :

क्या रेलवे मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या यह सच है कि रेलवे में काम करने वाले केवल कुछ कर्मचारियों को रात में काम करने का भत्ता दिया जाता है और अन्य कर्मचारियों को नहीं; और

(ख) यदि हां, तो इस भेदभाव के क्या कारण हैं ?

रेलवे मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (डा० राम सुभग सिंह) : (क) जी हां ।

(ख) सरकार के निर्णय के अनुसार अधिभार (weightage) रात की पारी में रखे गये केवल उन कर्मचारियों को दिया जाता है, जिनको अपनी ड्यूटी के दौरान 'निरन्तर' काम पर लगा रहना पड़ता है । रात की ड्यूटी करने वाले सभी कर्मचारियों को अधिभार नहीं दिया जाता । कर्मचारियों के जो वर्ग अधिभार पाने के पात्र हैं, उनकी वर्तमान सूची में केवल ऐसे वर्गों के कर्मचारी रखे गये हैं, जो ऊपर बताया गई शर्त को पूरा करते हैं ।

12.20 hrs.

RE: MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT AND CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTERS OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

SITUATION IN WEST BENGAL

Mr. Speaker: I have received notices of seven adjournment motions...

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What about my short notice question?

Mr. Speaker: Is there any short notice question in his name?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am afraid you are forgetting it. Yesterday when we raised it, you told us...

Mr. Speaker: I remember I had said so, that I would get that short notice question answered or some statement made. . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Today?

Mr. Speaker: I shall find out if the hon. Minister could do it today. So, what is the use of interrupting again and again?

श्री मौर्य (अलीगढ़) : अध्यक्ष महोदय मेरा नाम पुकारा नहीं गया है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने कहा है कि जब यह प्रायेगा तब आपको वक्त दे दूंगा ।

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May I seek one clarification from you? You in your wisdom have given a ruling that the hon. Minister should re-examine the case. But, on the other hand, the hon. Minister raised a doubt in our minds when he said that he had to find out the nature of the finding of Justice Mukherjee whom Government had appointed. From this, our conclusion is this that Government did not have any faith in the man whom they appointed.

The Minister of Industry (Shri D. Sanjivayya): No, no.

Mr. Speaker: That does not follow from it.

I have received notices of seven adjournment motions and sixteen calling-attention-notices in regard to the situation in West Bengal.

The whole thing is unfortunate, of course, and everybody must be sorry for what has happened there. There is no doubt about it. Some deaths have been there. . .

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indian): And loss of property also.

Mr. Speaker: There have been deaths and loss of property also. It is indeed very painful and all of us feel like that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Is the Chief Minister of West Bengal sorry?

Mr. Speaker: When I express it I express it on behalf of the whole House including those. . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What about the Chief Minister of West Bengal?

Mr. Speaker: I would tell Shri S. M. Banerjee that I should be allowed. . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He is killing men, and he has shot dead 17 people.

Mr. Speaker: So far as the adjournment motions are concerned, I am constrained to say that it would not be possible to have them admitted, but a statement must be made by the Minister today at some time, so that Members could also put questions and the whole thing might be cleared.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May we know why the adjournment motions could not be allowed?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Would you permit me, Sir, to plead with you regarding the admissibility of the adjournment motion? As you have said just now, the most grievous incidents have taken place and the people demoralized by the piling up of avoidable sufferings have done certain things which we may regret, but that is neither here nor there.

The fact is that the Centre's responsibility is definitely attracted on account of what appears to be virtually a breakdown of the Constitution in the State of West Bengal, and the mass popular upsurge from Alipur Duar in the north to the Calcutta region in the south is a consequence of the bankrupt and repressive policies of the Government of West Bengal.

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

which have already taken a toll of 17 lives. Quite apart from property whose loss you have referred to a little while ago, human lives also have been lost, and these lives are more important than property.

Mr. Speaker: I have referred to that already.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know you have referred to it. But the stress that we have to place in this Parliament is much more on the loss of human lives than on the loss of property, because I have heard on many an occasion an extenuation of the loss of human lives on the ground that properties have been destroyed. That was not your point of view, but the Government's point of view. . .

Mr. Speaker: I referred only to the deaths. Then, some hon. Member said "Loss of property also", and then I referred to that also.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know you have referred to it. But I have heard time and again in this House so many times on behalf of Government references to the loss of property, national property in particular, as something very much more to be deplored.

My feeling is that we here are functioning in a comparatively secure pocket of society, and we do not know the kind of psychology which impinges on the mind of people who suffer from week's end to week's end, of those who suffer from hunger and deprivation and all kinds of difficulties.

Therefore, in West Bengal a situation has been created much worse than what had happened in Kerala in 1959 when the President intervened in the matter on the advice of the Government which is functioning even today. I am not suggesting that that kind of thing should immediately be done, but under the Constitution, there are specific provisions which can be invoked in order that the Centre can give directives. . .

instance, if only the Opposition leaders now in jail can be released—they can sit down and discuss a way out of the matter—and if a few judicial inquiries could be ordered, possibly the healing touch could be provided to a situation which is going from bad to worse.

I beg of the Government to do something serious in this regard. That is why a discussion in this House on the basis of Government's responsibility in this matter would be very much appropriate.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): You asked me to make a statement regarding the situation there.

Mr. Speaker: They have said that Central responsibility is attracted on account of the failure of the Government to give a directive under the Constitution. That is put down in the notice. Have Government to say anything about it?

Shri Nanda: Yes. In spite of very serious efforts which have been made there to bring about a breakdown and that artificial upsurge which has been created, the Government of West Bengal. . . (*Interruptions*).

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): What does he mean by this? He says it is an artificial upsurge. What happened in Kerala in 1959? Who was behind that upsurge? The present Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi instigated it. . . (*Interruptions*).

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The Home Minister is backing P. C. Sen. P. C. Sen is a mental case. He is a murderer. The Home Minister is backing him.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: How can we manage with a Government like this? (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Not in this way. I would not be carried away by this.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है, मुझे धर्ज करने दीजिये। आपने यह सवाल उठाया कि काम-रोको प्रस्ताव इस लिए नहीं दिया जा सकता कि इस में केन्द्रीय सरकार की जिम्मेदारी नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं खुद उन से पूछ रहा हूँ, लेकिन आप बीच में बोल रहे हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : लेकिन वह जवाब कहाँ दे रहे हैं।

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I am very grateful to you for having posed that question to them on our behalf.

Mr. Speaker: I have not allowed it. I was interrupted.

Shri Ranga: But you have put it to them as the substance of all that we wanted to say and were saying, whether the responsibility of the Union Government is not to be invoked in view of what is happening there and the failure of the Government to maintain peace, and the failure of this Government also to give directions.

What I would like to urge, not in support to the adjournment motion, but only on the merits of this particular point, is this. The Prime Minister went there, and came back. We knew how it had failed. Then the Food and Agriculture Minister was thinking of going there, but he could not go. The Home Minister who has gone to various other places in connection with the trouble in the Mizo Hills and other things. . .

An hon. Member: He did not go there.

Shri Ranga: He would have been expected to have been there and advised them to do the right thing. He could not go, and he has not gone.

Now, what conclusion are we to draw in regard to the activities of this Central Government? The Home Min-

ister does not even take the trouble to seek your permission to take the initiative and begin to make a statement even before we ask for permission to raise this question. What does this show? And look at the daring way in which he faces the House this morning, so insulting, when 13 people have lost their lives. . .

An hon. Member: Seventeen.

Shri Ranga: I would have expected that my hon. friend is as conscientious as myself, as humanitarian as myself, ordinarily. But something has happened after he had become the Home Minister. Therefore, he comes here with an aggrieved demeanour and has the temerity to make a statement by way of that brief sentence that he uttered that everything was done to bring about a breakdown, but the Central Government has discharged its responsibility.

Shri Nanda: When I rose, it was with the intention of getting your permission to read my statement. I have got it ready with me. I wanted to place the facts before the House. If you give me permission, I would read it.

Shri Ranga: He did not even offer his apologies for the deaths of these people.

Mr. Speaker: He might make the statement.

Shri Nanda: With a deep feeling of pain and a sense of distress, which, I am sure, are shared by the whole House, I have to say that a series of regrettable incidents of lawlessness and violence, leading to police firing at several places and calling of troops in aid of civil authority. . .

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): On a point of information (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I would request the hon. Member to sit down.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: He is making a statement on a motion. Can I not ask for information on that?

Shri Nanda: ... I have marked the observance of Bengal Bundh yesterday. This was organised by the United Leftist Front to protest against the Government's food policy and in support of their demand for a judicial inquiry into the recent police firing at Basirhat on the 16th February. Government's efforts to ensure supplies of foodgrains to scarcity areas and especially the policy of the West Bengal Government in regard to arranging for distribution through an effective system of procurement and modified and statutory rationing have been repeatedly explained here and by the Chief Minister in the State Assembly. Those who were responsible for the Bengal Bundh must have been well aware of the possibility of the situation going out of their control despite their professed aim of keeping it peaceful, and of its resulting in loss of lives and destruction to public property. That was why some of us here had earlier appealed to those parties to desist from carrying out their programme, particularly so soon after similar disturbances in Nadia and other places in the State. They did not pay any heed to this warning, and what we all feared would happen has happened.

The incidents were especially severe in the Hooghly district where at Rishra, Konnagar and Hind Motors, Railway Stations violent mobs set fire to trains and railway overbridges, station cabins, goods sheds and booking offices, besides removing fishplates and damaging signalling gear. At Khardah in the 24-Parganas district and at Asansol in Burdwan district also, similar acts of arson, vandalism and violence were committed. At the latter place, the main targets of attack were the office of the Divisional Superintendent of the Railways, the Post Office, the INTUC office and the Government Khadi store. Train communications were disrupted and most

of the scheduled flights had to be cancelled. The police had to open fire to disperse violent mobs at Hind Motors station, Rishra, Konnagar, Khardah and Asansol and according to available reports, twelve persons are reported to have been killed.

Dr. Ranen Sen (Calcutta East): Seventeen.

Shri Nanda: Very much worse if it is seventeen. A sub-inspector of police was done to death by a mob at Konnagar and an Assistant Sub-Inspector of police died of injuries inflicted by a mob at Hind Motors. Units of the Army had to be called out by the State authorities to give support to police forces in maintaining law and order at many of these places. The situation in Calcutta deteriorated towards the evening along the now familiar pattern of attacking police parties, cutting off electricity and setting fire to vehicles. Despite all this, I understand that the Left-CPA has given a call to continue the agitation today.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Shri Nanda: Sir, it is with the deepest distress that I am making this statement to the House. Precious lives have been lost, causing intense suffering to a number of families. We express our most heartfelt sympathies for those bereaved. Valuable property belonging to the people of India has been destroyed. The feeling of sorrow is heightened by the awareness of the complete futility of it all, the total lack of purpose and responsibility behind it, knowing from past experience that it is not as easy to prevent occurrences of violence and wanton destruction as it is to incite sections of people against the rule of law. It is really unfortunate that the public life in our country is getting vitiated by the attitude and activities of certain groups who are yet to realise that the problems of improvement of the conditions of life of the common man. . .

Dr. Ranen Sen: Dismiss the Sen Ministry.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Dismiss the Chief Minister. He is a mental case. You are supporting a murderer.

श्री मधु लिमये : आपकी वजह से हो रहा है ।

Shri Nanda: . . . serious enough as they are—cannot be solved by taking recourse to violence, disorder and interference with the normal life of the citizens.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: This tirade means nothing. It shows that the Centre has not the slightest idea of its responsibilities.

Shri Ranga: It has become unpo- tent, that is all.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I beg leave of the House. . .

Mr. Speaker: I am not asking him to. He may put a question.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am pressing this adjournment motion because. . .

Mr. Speaker: He should realise. . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Let us explain the reasons. Why, you will not allow us to explain how it is a Central matter?

Mr. Speaker: I have heard Mr. Mukerjee in that respect.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No, Sir, we will quote your ruling.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: We have heard him say that the Centre has not the slightest intention of intervening beneficially or otherwise in the situation in West Bengal. I had expected that the Prime Minister being what she is, possibly some attempt, a remote attempt, would be made to bring the healing touch to the situation which has become so very bad. But here is the Home Minister who, in a hectoring tone of voice, says that the law

and order situation is bad and that people should behave,—(Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Let me finish my submission which is that the fact of Central responsibility being involved, the fact that the Home Minister's statement repudiates any desire on the part of the Government to exercise that Central responsibility—(Interruption)—therefore, under the rules, if we can muster sufficient support, we should have an opportunity of discussing the Adjournment Motion.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I have allowed one Member, and now others are also standing. I would ask Shri Banerjee to make his point because he is very impatient.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: There is no question of impatience, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I was required to hear only one; but now I am allowing another.

Shri Hem Barua: The names are there in the Calling Attention Notice.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; I have them.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I tabled the Adjournment Motion on the basis of, and replying on, article 353. Article 353 (a) of the Constitution reads as follows:

“-a) notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, the executing power of the Union shall extend to the giving of directions to any State as to the manner in which the executive power thereof is to be exercised”.

Now, article 356 (1) also says:

“If the President, on receipt of a report from the Governor of a State

[Shri S. M. Banerjee]

or otherwise, is satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the government of the State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution, the President may by Proclamation—

and so on and so forth.

My submission is this. I shall show how this matter becomes a matter for Central intervention. I have three points. One is, having known these conditions, having known the attitude of the Chief Minister of West Bengal who refuse to talk to the Opposition members and who realise more on calling the army and shooting the people. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: He need not refer to such things as . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I do not impute any motive to him.

Mr. Speaker: He ought to confine himself to the points that he wants to make in support of the admissibility of the motion.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: In the State legislature of West Bengal, at Calcutta, the number of the Opposition members has been reduced to 25 or so; many have been suspended. That is my first point. Then, the second point is, the Centre has failed in its duty to issue a direction to the State Government of West Bengal. The third point is, though the Governor has not submitted his report under article 356, otherwise also, a situation is there which deserves the intervention of the Centre.

I may here invite your kind attention to the previous ruling of the Speaker, or rather the ruling of the previous Speaker. An ex-Member of the House, Dr. K. B. Menon, raised the point and some of us did object to that. We said that a situation did not exist in Kerala. Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyangar who was then in the

Chair held that the Adjournment Motion be discussed in the House, on the basis of the report received from Mr. Mannath Padmanabhan, This Government which refuses to recognise the people's will in West Bengal, which refuses to talk even to the Opposition members, brought out an ordinance, a proclamation—(*Interruption*).—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Please sit down.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: If the situation in West Bengal is not controlled, it will become intolerable; Shri Sen, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, is not talking to the Opposition. It is a mental case. They are mad. (*Interruption*). This is the news paper run by Shri Asoke Sen, our ex-Minister.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard him. Order, order. Please sit down.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This is the statement of Mr. Ajoy Kumar Mukerjee; it is not a communist or a socialist paper. This gentleman is a Congressman; he is an ex-President of the West Bengal Congress Committee. Here, they support a judicial enquiry. They have said that the Government there is run by mad people (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: I have been asking him again and again to sit down. Is this the manner in which they should behave?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: 17 people have been killed; they are being killed like rats. I do not know what will happen; I may walk but here and now, and till the Government. . . (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: This is for him.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We want the Ministers here to go and see what is happening in West Bengal. Do they want us to be killed? The Home Minister is supporting a murderer. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: First I have to decide about the adjournment motion. I have disallowed it. I am prepared to allow them to put questions. That is all that I could do. Shri Madhu Limaye also would appreciate . . .

Shri K. N. Pande (Hata): I also want to say something.

Mr. Speaker: As I said in the beginning, I agree that the whole thing is regrettable. We are very sorry for it. That is a matter for sadness for everyone of us.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Not for this government; you saw the Home Minister's statement.

Mr. Speaker: In spite of all that, I have to be guided by certain rules. Therefore, I request members to be content with the call attention notice. I will allow questions to be asked and let us proceed with that business. I will call one by one—Mr. Mukerjee.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am very sorry, Sir; when you call upon me to ask a question, I normally would have availed of it. But the fact of the matter is, I can see from the attitude of the government that they are determined to see that no discussion on this matter properly speaking takes place. By way of asking questions, it is not possible for me to get the kind of policy assurances which are absolutely essential that I should get. This is the kind of attitude on the part of the government, which on the one hand tries to get us to try help in the solution of the problem in West Bengal—a little while ago, a Cabinet Minister came and told me, "Will you accompany me to West Bengal in order to see that a settlement is arrived at?". I offered from this end, "I shall help you. You can go and get our people out of the jail, discuss the matter and have a settlement". But now the Home Minister is talking in a language which we are not going to tolerate. In view of this attitude on the part of the government, the only thing I can do is, being in a minority

in this House, to register our utterest indignation with the ways of this government by leaving the House. That is the only gesture we can show.

Shri S. M. Bamerjee: Will you allow them to convert the entire country into a slaughter house?

(*Shri H. N. Mukerjee and some other hon. Members then left the House.*)

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): I want to know whether this government propose now or soon after the situation comes under control to make some kind of probe to determine as to how the present situation was allowed to develop into what it has developed into, and then to proceed to fix responsibility on those who have the duty of governing West Bengal?

Shri Nanda: In any such situation, when developments of this serious character occur, it is certainly the responsibility of the Government to look into the matter as closely as possible. In this case also, it is the responsibility of the Union Government to assist the Government of the State and we will do that.

Shri Ranga: I was hoping that he would give a reasonable, sensible and responsible enough answer to this very important and relevant question. From his reply it is clear that in spite of whatever this government has been doing, they have been behaving in such a shameless manner towards the opposition, towards democracy, by refusing to talk to the opposition leaders and seek their cooperation and win public support in order to mend matters. All that I would like to do is this. I did not wish to do that before; I was only waiting for some sign of repentance on the part of the government. All that I can do is—it is very much against my usual practice in this House—to dissociate myself from this part of the discussion this morning. I am sorry.

(*Shri Ranga and some other hon. members then left the House.*)

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): I do not know whether the Home Minister will be prepared to answer this question, but I would like to put it to him. The statement that he read out in the House leaves no doubt in the minds of those who have cared to listen to it that the Government of West Bengal, having known that this particular type of situation will arise, has miserably failed to protect the lives and properties of the people of West Bengal. In view of its having so failed to keep law and order, which we shout here is merely a State subject, in view of its having felt itself so effeminate, inefficacious and incompetent to maintain law and order, will the government consider here and now the possibility of dismissing this government of West Bengal?

Shri Nanda: The hon. member draws some conclusions from my statement which do not emerge from that statement. In spite of the provocation and all that has been done there, government has tried to do its best to save property and what is more important to save lives. It has to do that job and they have done it.

Shri Hem Barua: The loss of property is regrettable, but the loss of human life is still more regrettable and it is unforgettable. Our government have functioned in a very limited way and they have encouraged the West Bengal Government to let loose leonine violence in West Bengal. I am very sorry that when our Prime Minister visited Calcutta, she did not see the leaders of the opposition parties on the ground that they were behind prison bars. She could have gone to the prison, not to stay there permanently but for a brief period, and met the leaders there.

Mr. Speaker: What is the clarification he wants?

Shri Hem Barua: I want to know whether the Government propose to function in this limited way so far as

West Bengal is concerned, because there is failure of the government to give food to the people and ensure security to the people in the State, or they want to take some positive steps and meet the leaders of the opposition parties like Prof. Samar Guha, who was to meet the Prime Minister, but who was hurried back to the prison before he could meet her? Are government going to meet the leaders of opposition parties and come to a settlement in bringing about peace in the State or would they like to function in the limited way they are functioning today?

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): I tried to catch your eye earlier, but you were looking in the other direction.

Mr. Speaker: I was charged that I had stiffness on my left. If there is stiffness on both sides, then I am quite normal.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I think that unnecessary things have been read into the statement made by the Home Minister, as he himself has pointed out. It is not only a matter of deep regret, but of very great sorrow that such things should have taken place and specially that so many lives should have been lost. But I assure hon. Members will appreciate that when there is an attempt to remove sleepers or fish-plates and so on, then action has to be taken. It is not true that the Central Government is not fully in touch with happenings.

When I went to Calcutta, I was placed in a rather difficult situation, because certain plans had already been laid for yesterday. In those circumstances, it was difficult to hold the hand of the State Government or say that they should not protect the average citizen who was not concerned with the bundh. However, we do want the full support of the opposi-

tion members, specially those who come from Bengal, in solving this matter. I want to assure them that there is no question of any rigidity of attitude in this matter. We have consulted some of them already and we hope to consult more of them.

The time of his going has not been fixed, but the Home Minister has already made some plans for going to Calcutta. And it was in that connection that we have called even some opposition members to go. We are genuinely anxious to find some way out.

Having said this, Sir, I must again repeat what I said on a previous occasion, that it is easy to start a movement of this kind, but it does very soon go out of hands, and when there is question of law and order breaking down or ordinary life being completely disrupted then it becomes much more difficult to take any of the actions which one would take in the normal course. I would, therefore, beg of the hon. Members, through you, Sir, that in this we should again sit together and try to evolve some method of dealing with these happenings. I want to say that the Chief Minister of West Bengal, though it is not for me to speak on his behalf, himself is not adopting a rigid attitude. It is true he did not meet members of the Opposition on an earlier occasion but, again, it was because of the plan which had been laid for the bundh on the 10th of this month. He felt that with this plan for violence, unless there was less rigidity on their part the meeting would serve no useful purpose. But I think now we can look at all these matters afresh if we have the co-operation of the hon. Members opposite.

Shri Frank Anthony: Sir, I can understand the conciliatory approach of the hon. Prime Minister—especially she is a lady—but so far as the Home Minister is concerned, I do not understand why he should attempt to be apologetic. Reading the newspapers

it appeared to be clear that what happened was the handiwork of professional, political saboteurs. There was organised Vandalism and violence (*Interruptions*). Well, the papers have it. According to several of them... (*Interruptions*). Well, the papers have I read in the newspapers. According to at least two newspapers, Sir—I do not know whether they are correct—violence and vandalism erupted simultaneously in five areas. I want to know whether that is correct?

Shri Nanda: It is so.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, you began by striking a right note, I think, by expressing distress about the developments that have been taking place (*Interruption*). Sir, one is filled with deep dismay and distress at what has been happening, and it has been going on for a period of time. I am not here to pass a judgment, but one does feel a hurt in one's heart, as the President had to point out, recently speaking in Delhi, that violence is in the air. But where shall we go? The Prime Minister said now that she wants to make an effort. I do not know if Government has taken a very serious view not only in the limited sense that there is violence and sabotage, removing of fish-plates and all that, but also that there is distress on the part of the people and it needs to be met in an imaginative way. How does Government help to prevent violence? Shall we go on having indefinitely this chain action, shooting by the police, then violence, then more shooting and then more violence? Does not Government feel called upon to try to make an imaginative approach? I find that the Prime Minister was good enough to strike at least a sympathetic note. I think she was very sincere about it. But how does she explain that her colleagues in Bengal are trying to do everything possible to put an end to this? It is not enough to blame this party or that party. I think the whole country is standing to lose. I do not think our prestige is

[Shri Nath Pai]

going higher either by the colossal failure of the Government or I think by the unfortunate response of the hungry crowds. We are all standing to lose in the eyes of the world.

Sir, this is the only democracy that functions from Tokyo to Accra. We know how other countries have gone down the drain of dictatorship. We cannot afford this kind of thing to go on indefinitely. India remains the only democracy. We want to see that this is not crippled. Here it will not help us by pointing out accusing fingers at one another. Much more will have to be done.

Sir, the Prime Minister did not reply to a pertinent, simple question. A respected leader of the Opposition had an appointment to meet the Prime Minister. What happened? He was hustled into the jail. Who assumed the authority to prevent a well known professor to meet the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister deny this, that Professor Samar Guha had an appointment with her? He is a man who is not known for violence. This shows the callousness on the part of the administration.

Mr. Speaker: He may now . . .

Shri Nath Pai: I want to sit down, Mr. Speaker, by asking this question (Interruption). It is very serious matter. It is not a matter to laugh. Houses are burnt, lives are lost. Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand how anybody can bring himself to laugh derisively.

Mr. Speaker: He might put the question now.

Shri Nath Pai: Will Shri Nanda tell us, or the Prime Minister for that matter, one thing? Do not they also consider that it is not enough to say that the crowd tried to pull down fish plates. I have the courage to say that it is bad enough. It is regrettable. It is unfortunate. But could they tell us that they have taken this challenge of food? Mr. Speaker, moving in my

constituency—I just came—I saw agonizing spectacles. I saw women in the queue crying, weeping, touching my feet and asking: "How are we to support our babes"—whom they carried in their arms. "What do we do?" They asked. I had no reply. Though in some parts of the country people are very patient, very quiet, very disciplined, Bengal points the portentous way for the country. Unless the Prime Minister and her colleagues will sit down and try to do something more than throw in the face of the people the argument that this is a provincial matter and it is not a union matter, the position will become worse. Is it not that the whole fabric of democracy is threatened? When that is the position, are we going to take this procedural approach? What is it that she proposes to do in an imaginative manner, to meet this problem in a wider way and not in terms of blaming somebody. Somebody may be blame-worthy. Let us have a judicial inquiry. But let us not say that with that our responsibility is finished. I would like to know from the Prime Minister—she made a good beginning—what is it that she or Shri Nanda want to do. Cannot the leaders be released? Cannot negotiations be held?

Mr. Speaker: Now, let me hear them also.

Shri Nanda: Sir, as the hon. Members has said, certainly it touches the heart of any anybody who has seen those pathetic scenes. It is not that the Centre is denying its responsibilities. They are doing everything possible to relieve hardship. Time and again it has been explained as to what efforts are being made. More will be done. Whatever is possible will be done by the nation as a whole. The sentiments expressed by the hon. Member is possibly true. It is not that one party or one section has to do it. After all, all of us have to sit together and do it. It is a matter for the whole nation. The future of the nation is at stake. Therefore, we are

trying to do everything possible and we are prepared to do everything more that is possible to bring about that sense of security and stability in the nation so that we can grapple with our problem successfully.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अब प्रधान मंत्री जी बोल रही थीं तो मैं अचरज कर रहा था कि * *

अध्यक्ष महोदय, उन्होंने जो जुमला कहा (व्यवधान) . . अब आप शांति से सुन लीजिये । दर्द हो रहा है इसलिये बोल रहा हूँ । . . . (व्यवधान) . . . सुन लीजिये । अध्यक्ष महोदय, उन्होंने जो जुमला कहा कि आन्दोलन शुरू करना आसान है लेकिन उसके ऊपर नियंत्रण करना मुश्किल है . . . (व्यवधान)

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxer): Sir, not only the words of the hon. Member should be expunged, but he should be asked to go out of the House.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या किया है मैंने ? यह संसदीय नहीं है ।

Mr. Speaker: He should withdraw these words.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या वापस लें ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने जो लफ्ज यह कहे हैं .

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने कहा कि मुझे अचरज हो रहा था, मैंने यह नहीं कहा कि "हूँ" .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह नामुनासिब . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं अपनी बात को जब पूरा करूंगा तो आप समझ जायेंगे । . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, मैं समझा या नहीं, आप इसको वापस लें ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरी बात सुनने के बाद अगर आपको ऐसा लगेगा तो मैं उसके बारे में सोचूंगा । . . . (व्यवधान)
आप मेरी पूरी बात सुन लीजिए

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने सोच लिया । आप वापस लें . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : लेकिन क्या वापस लें ? मैंने यह कहा था कि मुझे अचरज हो रहा है । मैंने यह नहीं कहा था कि वह हैं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने समझ लिया जो आपने कहा था । आर्डर आर्डर । . . . (व्यवधान) . . . जो आपने कहा था वह मैंने समझ लिया था । इसलिये मैं कह रहा हूँ कि आप उसको वापस ले लीजिए ।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप मेरी पूरी बात सुन लीजिये । . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप वापस ले रहे हैं या नहीं ?

श्री मधु लिमये : लेकिन उसमें गलत क्या है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप मेरे साथ बहस नहीं कर सकते ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है (व्यवधान) . . . मैं व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा रहा हूँ । वह बिल्कुल ठीक है (व्यवधान) ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर । . .

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं बहुत प्रदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ . . . (व्यवधान) . . . मुझे व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने का अधिकार है । . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आपसे कह रहा हूँ कि यह लफ्ज आप वापस लेंगे या नहीं . .

श्री मधु लिमये : इसी के बारे में व्यवस्था का प्रश्न

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर आप वापस नहीं लेते तो आपको बाहर जाना होगा . . . (व्यवधान) . . . मैंने कहा कि या तो आप वापस लें या

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूँ । किस नियम के अन्तर्गत आप ऐसा कह रहे हैं ? क्या यह अशिष्ट है या असंसदीय है ?

13 hrs.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आइंर, आइंर । मैंने आप से कहा कि या तो आप अपने वह अल्फाब वापिस ले लें या फिर आप को हाउस से बाहर जाना होगा ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं बहुत अदब के साथ कह रहा हूँ .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मैं इस पर और बहस नहीं करूंगा ।

श्री मधु लिमये : इस तरह की बातें इस सदन में कई मत्तबा हुई हैं और माननीय सदस्यों ने कई दफ्ते कहा है तो मेरे साथ यह अन्याय क्यों होता है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने आप से कहा कि आप वापिस ले लें या आप बाहर चले जायें ।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप नियम संख्या तो सुनिये .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं कोई नियम संख्या नहीं सुनता ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं अकेला आदमी पड़ा हूँ, छोटे दल का आदमी पड़ा हूँ, इसलिये

मिरे साथ अन्याय न किया जाय । आइंर यह संसदीय प्रणाली काहे के लिए होती है ? हर एक मेम्बर के अधिकारों की रक्षा करना आप का कर्तव्य है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आप को नामउद कर के कहता हूँ कि आप इस हाउस की कार्यवाही में बाधा डाल रहे हैं . . . ।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप व्यवस्था का प्रश्न सुनिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य हाउस की कार्यवाही में बाधा डाल रहे हैं और स्पीकर का जो कहना है उसको नहीं मान रहे हैं ।

The Minister of State in the Department of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Jaganatha Rao):
Sir. I move:

"That Shri Madhu Limaye named by the Speaker, be suspended from the service of the House for the rest of the session".

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने मुना तक नहीं कि क्या उन्होंने कहा ?

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That Shri Madhu Limaye, named by the Speaker, be suspended from the service of the House for the rest of the session."

The motion was adopted.

An. hon. Member: Sir, it is too harsh (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: When there is a motion, I have to put it to the House.

Another hon. Member: Why was it not moved by the Leader of the House?

Mr. Speaker: Any member can move it.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, I would request you to reconsider the decision.

Mr. Speaker: The motion has been adopted already.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : बाकी पूरे सेशन के लिए इस तरह से निकाल कर बड़ा अन्याय हो रहा है। ऐसा कर के हमारे साथ अन्याय हो रहा है। सात दिन के लिए निकाला जा सकता था लेकिन पूरे सेशन के लिए निकाल कर के गला काटा जा रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मोशन मंजूर हो चुका है अब इस पर डिबेट नहीं हो सकती।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : मेरी एक बात सुन लीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाइये।

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I wan to make one submission. I would request the Leader of the House to come to the rescue of this Opposition Member. Such things have happened before in this House but such strong action has not been taken against any Member. The proposal for suspending him from the service of the House for the whole of the session is very harsh and also unprecedented. I would appeal to the House to consider this proposition. If he is to be suspended, let the suspension be only for one week.

Shri Nath Pal: Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal to the Leader of the House and the Prime Minister to ponder and reflect for a minute upon the gravity of the sentence that has been passed on a Member. I do not think we will be adding to our own prestige if we try to meet what we think a fal-

lure on the part of a Member with this kind of intolerance. If it is disagreement about the appropriate language, it has not been finally decided by you as a scholar of parliamentary practice. I will not support the words used by Shri Limaye. I think I would not use them. But when Shri Limaye says that he did not accuse her of being this (Interruptions). If there was insult, he tried to realise from the position by saying "I never accused". Even the use of that may be, according to your judgement with which we must all agree, wrong. Even if he has used that word in that way—I do not defend what he said—I am equally appalled by the spectacle that straightway we proceed to inflict the highest punishment on him of suspending him from the service of the House for the whole session. I want Shri Satya Narayan Sinha not to be just precipitating this kind of thing; Government must not precipitate such a thing for a wrong action said to have been taken by a Member by taking this drastic, radical, unwarranted and unjustified sentence of suspension of a member for the rest of the session.... (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He should address me. When such a motion is moved, there cannot be any debate. I have to put it to the vote. I have allowed him to make some observations. Now he should conclude.

Shri Nath Pal: So far as we are concerned, this has come to us as a rude shock. I may be young, but I have been a Member for ten long years. It is very rarely that the House loses its sense of tolerance. What is great of this House is that it is a tolerant House. We want this House to continue to exist for times to come. It may be endangered by our misbehaviour. But it can be equally endangered by this kind of intolerance. There is only one appeal I want to make to the spokesmen of the Government, to the Prime Minister and Shri Satya Narayan Sinha. Let them

[Shri Nath Pai]

reflect for a minute..... (Interruptions).

Sir, you will remember, that on an earlier occasion, when you were the Deputy-Speaker, one member of Shri Madhu Limaye's party was suspended and he had to be removed by the Marshall. He was suspended for seven days. I wrote a letter about this to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He replied: I agree with you; perhaps the punishment was too harsh; anyhow it is nearly over; otherwise, I would have asked for a re-consideration. Here is a man who symbolises the great concern for democratic working. In spite of the fact that the motion was moved by a member of his party, he was ready and willing to reconsider that decision. So, I make an appeal to you: let us not be so intolerant and harsh. Democracy does not function by intolerance.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I cannot allow a regular debate if so many Members want to speak.

Shri Hem Barua: As a Member suspended on a previous occasion, I want to say something.

Shri Nath Pai: I want to move a formal amendment to the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Nath Pai must concede that the motion has been carried.

Shri Kapur Singh: Unfortunately, I was not in the House when the impugned words were spoken, but I understand that certain words have been spoken to which exception has been taken and certain meanings have been ascribed to those words which meanings the hon. Member denies. I merely wish to make a respectful submission. As my hon. friend, Shri Nath Pai, has stated, though the dignity of the House and the privileges of the House are great, that dignity and those privileges also require that compassion, mercy, a sense of balance and tolerance of this House should be

equally great. I, therefore, pray that no sentence should be passed on the hon. Member which would even remotely suggest that a vindictive view has taken of what has been said by him.

Mr. Speaker: There is one thing that I must make clear. There is some confusion that such deterrent or, what might be called, vindictive punishment, as suggested by Shri Kapur Singh . . .

Shri Nath Pai: *Prima facie* it looks so.

Mr. Speaker: . . . has been awarded or given to a certain Member because he has used certain words that are objectionable. That is what has been argued; but Members do not realise this much that I only requested him to withdraw those words. There was no question of any punishment being given. He could easily have done it. Then I requested him that if he was not prepared to withdraw the words, he might withdraw himself.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह तो मैंने सुना नहीं ।

Shri Kapur Singh: If that is the position, it requires reconsideration.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बड़े श्रद्ध के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैंने वह सुना नहीं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रापोजीशन के मेम्बर साहबान बैठे हुए हैं और वे जानते हैं कि मैंने इतनी बार कहा, लेकिन माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि उन्होंने सुना नहीं । वह मेरे साथ धार्म्य करते रहे कि मैं चला जाऊंगा, लेकिन पहले मेरी बात सुनिये । अब वह कहते हैं कि मैंने सुना नहीं है ।

Shri U. M. Trivedi: We all heard it.

Mr. Speaker: I am just giving the sequence.

Shri Nath Pal: He had said something, one sentence only.... (Interruption). I am advocating the cause of my Parliament. Shri Limaye did say this sentence—the proceedings will show it or the tape-recorder will show it—

“मैंने कब कहा है कि मैं नहीं मानूंगा ?”

Mr. Speaker: I remember that.

Shri Nath Pal: But when did he say that he was not going to obey?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह बड़ी अजीब बात है। मैं श्री नाथ पाई से कहूंगा कि अगर कोई माननीय सदस्य मेरी बात तो न माने, लेकिन यह कहे कि मैंने कब कहा है कि मैं नहीं मानूंगा तो यह ठीक नहीं है। माननीय सदस्य इस को अलाहिदा कर के, डीटैच कर के, न देखें, बल्कि वे होल कन्टेक्स्ट को देखें। मैंने श्री मधु लिमये से कहा कि वह अपने लफ़्ज़ वापस ले लें। क्या मैंने उन को कोई बुरी बात कही? लेकिन चाहे वह बात गलत हो या दुरुस्त—मैं तो मानता हूँ कि मैंने दुरुस्त कहा था—, माननीय सदस्य को अपने लफ़्ज़ वापस लेने चाहिए थे और इस बारे में ज़िद नहीं करनी चाहिए थी। मैंने उन को दूसरा चांस दिया कि अगर वह अपने लफ़्ज़ वापस नहीं लेते हैं, तो वह हाउस से विदड़ा करे।

श्री मधु लिमये : यह मैंने नहीं सुना।

मैं अब भी आप की आज्ञा मानने के लिए तैयार हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर वह ऐसा कहते हैं, तो यह बड़े अफ़मांस की बात है। माननीय सदस्य इस बात पर इनसिस्ट कर रहे थे कि पहले उन की बात सुनी जायें। वह आर्ग्यु कर रहे थे। यह सवाल नहीं है कि चूँकि उन्होंने वे लफ़्ज़ कहे, इसलिए उन को यह सज़ा दी जा रही है। सवाल यह है कि मैं बार-बार कहता रहा, अपील करता रहा मैं ने इतना सब किया, इतनी पेशान्स दिखाई, लेकिन वह

मेरी बात नहीं माने। क्या इसके बावजूद मेम्बर साहबान यह समझते हैं कि मुझे कुछ नहीं करना चाहिए था? इस के बाद मैंने उन को नेम किया और जब नेम किया, तो उन को पनिशमेंट दीं जानी थी।

Shri Hem Barua: On a previous occasion when I was suspended for seven days, the hon. Leader of the House, Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, was so good.... (Interruption)—that is a fact—

Shri Kapur Singh: As a rule he is good.

Shri Hem Barua: He contacted me over the phone and said that he was ready to reconsider the whole matter. In this particular case also Shri Nath Pai has already appealed to him and to the Prime Minister also to reconsider this. I move an amendment. . .

Some hon. Member: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): What are all these arguments? What prevents the gentleman from withdrawing his words?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Our House has been claiming to lead entire Asia in the matter of democracy. The words uttered by him, in translation, will naturally go in the international press and will be quoted for or against this House in parliamentary parlance as a low standard. Therefore I submit that in spite of my sentiment of chivalry that our Prime Minister is a woman, in spite of the fact that people behind her—the Ministers and Deputy Ministers—may be very anxious to proclaim their loyalty to her, we do expect of you as a seasoned politician and a man of long experience of parliamentary democracy that you should not allow such irresponsible or extra-responsible, whatever it may be, sentiments or proposition to be made and immediately pass that without giving us a chance to

[Shri N. Sreekantan Nair]

speak. It is a disgrace; it is a shame and I walk out of the House.

(Shri N. Sreekantan Nair then left the House)

The Leader of the House (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Sir, you have made it perfectly clear that whatever sentence has been passed by the House against him was not due to the remarks which he has made but because of his defiance of your ruling when you asked him to get out of the House for at least one day.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने वह सुना नहीं ।

Some hon. Members: Both.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Both, maybe. But, as to the appeals which have been made, two days ago I said and said it with distress that with the things which are happening in the House we are reaching the limit really. You are also fully aware of it. Every day in this House and outside how people talk about what things are happening in this House for the last ten days or since we started the Budget session. It is a matter of regret for all of us concerned, but with the things which have been happening, as I said, the matter is reaching the limit—it has reached the limit. Sometimes there is a little feeling this side also. Still, today after the appeal which has been made, if the hon. Member is prepared to apologise unconditionally, I would request the House to reconsider the sentence which has been passed against him.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर सदन-नेता यह कहते हैं कि मैंने आप की आज्ञा का उल्लंघन किया और उस के लिए मैं खेद प्रकट करूँ, तो मैं फिर खुलासा करता हूँ । मैंने आप का यह कहना नहीं सुना था कि मैं सदन छोड़ कर चला जाऊँ। (Interruptions) मैं झूठ बात नहीं बोलता हूँ । जहाँ तक शब्दों को वापस लेने का सवाल है, मैं सिद्धांत

पर ज़क़ंग । जो हल्ला करना चाहते हैं, बे करे । जहाँ तक शब्दों को वापस लेने का सवाल है, उसके बारे में मैं आप के साथ बहस कर रहा था या बयान कर रहा था । लेकिन अगर किसी को गलतफ़हमी है कि मैं सदन छोड़ने की आप की आज्ञा का उल्लंघन करना चाहता था, तो यह मेरा इरादा नहीं था । अगर उन को गलतफ़हमी हुई है, तो मैं उस के लिए खेद प्रकट करने के लिए तैयार हूँ । (Interruptions).

मैं अध्यक्ष महोदय की आज्ञा के अनुसार सदन छोड़ कर चला जाऊँगा ।

Shri Kapur Singh: This might be accepted. He has apologised.

Mr. Speaker: I hope, the House would accept this much. Does the House accept this much?

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Now I would appeal to the House to be indulgent enough. If he expresses that, this would mean that he goes out of the House.

An hon. Member: He should withdraw the words also.

श्री मधु लिमये : अगर मेरे शब्दों के लिए यह सजा नहीं है और आप की आज्ञा है कि मैं चला जाऊँ, तो मैं आप की आज्ञा का उल्लंघन नहीं करना चाहता हूँ । मैं चला जाता हूँ ।

(Shri Madhu Limaye then left the House).

Shri D. C. Sharma: Those words should be expunged from the proceedings.

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती (अज्जर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे बोलने का अवसर दीजिए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस बात पर नहीं ।

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती : इस बात पर नहीं, मैं एक आवश्यक बात कहना चाहता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री कछवाय ।

श्री जगदेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे अवसर दे दीजिए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अध्यक्ष महोदय, . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जब मैं खड़ा हूँ, तो अब माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें ।

I had said that the motion is carried. These are on record. So, it can be rescinded by the House only.

An hon. Member: Those words should also be expunged.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sir, I beg to move:

"That in view of the apology offered by Shri Madhu Limaye, the order of the House suspending him from the service of the House for the rest of the session, be rescinded."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That in view of the apology offered by Shri Madhu Limaye, the order of the House suspending him from the service of the House for the rest of the session, be rescinded."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: In view of what has happened, the *portion which he had said and which I had taken exception to would be expunged.

Shri Kachhavaia.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मैं जानना चाहता हूँ, मंत्री महोदय

अध्यक्ष महोदय : टपव क्वेश्चन की जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री जादेव सिंह सिद्धान्ती : मेरी बात सुन लीजिये, मैं कभी कभी बोलता हूँ, हमेशा नहीं बोलता हूँ। आप इजाजत देंगे तो बोलूंगा ।

माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मेरे सुझाव को अच्छी तरह से देख लें, ऐसा गन्दा वाद-विवाद कभी अच्छा नहीं होता लोक सभा की कुछ मर्यादाएँ हैं, अगर उन मर्यादाओं को बारबार भंग किया जायगा तो हमारी लोक सभा का बड़ा भारी अपमान होगा और खास कर जब कि उसका सम्बन्ध हमारे प्रधान मंत्री से हो । मैं कांग्रेसी बिल्कुल नहीं हूँ, कांग्रेस का विरोधी हूँ, लेकिन इतना होने पर भी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री का कुछ मान है, उनका विदेशों में अपना मान है, वह एक देवी हैं । और देवी के प्रति ऐसे शब्दों का उच्चारण करना अत्यन्त ही बुरा है । मैं उन के प्रति बहुत घृणा प्रकट करता हूँ और आप से निवेदन करता हूँ कि इस प्रकार के मामलों में आप कठोर अनुशासन से काम लीजिये । अगर इसी तरह से बार बार उनकी भ्रवहेलना की जायगी तो यह रोग बढ़ता चला जायगा । मैंने ये शब्द केवल इस सदन की मर्यादा के लिए कहे हैं, मान के लिये कहे हैं यह किसी पार्टीबाजी का सवाल नहीं है भार सरकार का यह कर्त्तव्य है कि वह ऐसे काम न करे कि जैसे उनको यहाँ शब्द सुनने पड़े ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं इन के एक-एक शब्द की प्रीढ़ता करता हूँ । हाउस इस वक्त अपनी जिम्मेदारी को सम्भालें । इस वक्त हमारी डेमोक्रेसी खतरे में है । हम गार्डियन हैं डेमोक्रेसी के । अगर हर एक मेम्बर अपना फर्ज नहीं समझेगा तो हम इस

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

को कायम नहीं रख सकते। दुनिया देख रही है कि हिन्दुस्तान में क्या होता है। हमारे जो मुखालिफ़ हैं वह इस बात को बड़ी बेचैनी से देख रहे हैं। वह चाहते हैं कि हम गिरें। इसको सम्भाले रखना हमारा फर्ज है। और यह हमारे कंधों पर एक बोझ है। अगर हम कहीं फिसल गये तो आने वाली नस्लें हमें कभी माफ़ नहीं करेंगी। जो कुछ सिद्धान्ती जी ने कहा है मैं उसको प्रोढ़ता करता हूँ कि हर एक मेम्बर को चाहिये कि वह इस का ज़रूर ख्याल रखे।

श्री काशी नाथ पांडे (हाता) : आपने सिद्धान्ती जी की हर बात का समर्थन किया, लेकिन आखिर में उन्होंने दूसरी ही बात कही है। उन्होंने कहा है कि गवर्नमेंट को चाहिये कि ऐसे काम न करे कि ऐसा सुनना पड़े। हम इसका समर्थन नहीं करते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इतना कह देना कि ऐसा न करे, यह कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं है।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : मैं एक सदस्य के नाते ऐसा अनुभव करता हूँ कि लोक सभा और जितनी भी विधायक सभायें हैं, इन सब के द्वारा देश का गौरव सुरक्षित रहे। उस सम्बन्ध में सिद्धान्ती जी ने शब्द कहे हैं। उनका जो अन्तिम वाक्य था, उस के सम्बन्ध में, मैं समझता हूँ कि उस पर पांडे जी को कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने भी यही कहा है कि कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : मेरा कहना आपके द्वारा पांडे जी से यह है कि पांडे जी भी इस बात का अहसास करें कि देश में जनतंत्र पर जो आघात होने वाला है, विधान सभाओं

में जो गड़बड़ आरम्भ हो रही है, जहाँ उसमें छोटी संख्या में बैठे हुए विरोधी दलों का दायित्व है, वहाँ बहु-संख्या में बैठे हुए सत्तारूढ़ दल का भी दायित्व है सरकार का दायित्व भी विशेष रूप से है। जहाँ हम अपने कर्तव्य का पालन करें, वहाँ आप भी अपने अधिकारों में सीमा से इतना आगे न चले जायें कि विरोधियों को इन बातों का सहारा लेना पड़े। इस लिये आप भी अपने दायित्व से बच नहीं सकते।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : जिस सन्दर्भ में ये बातें हो गईं, वे बातें आपने नहीं सुनी

अध्यक्ष महोदय : स्वामी जी आप खत्म कर दीजिये।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं कहना है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : फिर आपको कहने की कुछ ज़रूरत नहीं है। स्वामी जी आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : आप जो भी निर्णय देंगे वैसे करूंगा, लेकिन सुन लें।

हम ने स्थगन प्रस्ताव दिये हैं, उस के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह अब खत्म हो गया है, अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा निवेदन सुन लें, मैं बैठ जाऊंगा, अगर आप कहेंगे तो मैं बाहर निकल जाऊंगा, लेकिन मेरा निवेदन सुन लें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर आप इस बात के लिये तैयार हैं कि मैं ज़रूर अ पको कहूँ, तो मैं तो नहीं कहता कि आप बाहर निकलें।