

14.30 hrs.

STATEMENT RE: RAW COTTON
SUPPLY SITUATION

श्री ड० त्रि० पाटिल यवतमाल : नम्रापति मंडलय, मैंने महागण्ट्र श्रीर गुजरात के संसद सदस्यों के दस्तबर्जों से कपास के बाजार की विकट स्थिति के बारे में श्रीर कपास की सोलिंग प्राइम इस टुकके बढ़ने के बारे में ध्यान आकषण प्रस्ताव । दिसम्बर, 1966 को दिया था ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर ।
आप तजरीर रखें ।

श्री ड० बि० पाटिल : मैं आपके जरिये से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सार्वजनिक महत्व के ध्यान आकषण प्रस्ताव का तरफ मवी मंडलय का ध्यान हुआ नहीं ।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. Shri Manubhai Shah.

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Manubhai Shah): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the House would recall that on the 25th/26th of November,—

Mr. Chairman: How many pages?

Shri Manubhai Shah: Six pages.

Mr. Chairman: It may be laid on the Table.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): But as in the case of Call Attention Notices, we should be permitted to ask one question each.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. If he just lays it on the Table of the House, then on Monday, you can ask questions, because that will save some time also.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): If the hon. Minister would be kind enough to supply a copy of it in advance, we can put questions after studying it.

Mr. Chairman: That will be done.

Shri Manubhai Shah: Sir, I beg to lay the statement on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-7518/66].

CONSTITUTION (TWENTY-THIRD
AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, Dr. Singhvi.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Evidently, as two Supreme Court judges pointed out, the State Government of Uttar Pradesh has acted in clear contravention of article 233 which relates to the appointment of district judges and article 235. As a matter of fact, if I may say so, the State Government has acted in clear contravention of the Constitution and has acted contemptuously of the Constitution. After all, articles 233 and 235 are very clear, and they clearly enjoin upon the State Governments to function in a particular way in respect of the judicial officers. While this was quite clear in the Constitution, the State Government resumes upon itself to treat the high court as a transmitting office; the State Government presumes to treat the high court with contempt, with disregard and, if I may say so, with an utter lack of respect. In this case, since the Supreme Court has struck down the appointments, it is only right that the Union Government should come here, not in defence of the action of the Government of the State but in rectification of it. What the hon. Minister of Law is claiming is that he seeks to rectify through this Act the mistakes or the errors of the lapses that were committed by the State Government. It is far from the actual situation. As a matter of fact, if he was seeking only rectification, that would have been a different matter. But that is being sought is to validate what was wrong; what is being sought is that what was wrong and unconstitutional is sought to be made constitutional on the ground which is not correct.