

obviously other changes must also be made. I am only explaining to my hon. friend that there is no catch in it at all.

Shri T. N. Singh: What about other places. There are also other constituencies in which radical changes appear, at least to me to have been made. For instance, against Banaras it is "Sheopur pargana and Dehat Amanat pargana excluding the Municipality and Cantonment of Banaras". Again take them (v): "Jalhupur, Sultanipur and Katehar parganas of Banaras tahsil". Formerly I think it was only Sultanpur and Katehar parganas. You have added one full pargana. I want to know what is the reason for this change.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will now put it to the House.

The question is :

That the following modifications be made in the Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly Constituencies (Uttar Pradesh) (Amendment) Order, 1951 laid on the Table on the 20th September 1951, namely:

(1) That at page 1, in para. 2 (ii), after the words "but including Mohammadi," the words "Atwa Piparia," be inserted.

(2) That at page 1, in para. 2 (iii), after the bracket and words "(excluding Mohammadi," the words "Atwa Piparia," be inserted.

(3) That at page 2, in para. 3 (i), in the Table for the entry (North) *cum* Chamoli (East)" in column 1, the following entry be substituted ; namely:—

"Pauri (South) *cum* Chamoli (East)"

"(iiia) for the entries "Mohammadi (West)" and "Mohammadi (East)" in column 1, and for the entries against them in column 2, the following entries be substituted, namely:—

1	2
Mohammadi (West)	Mohammadi, Atwa Piparia Magadpur and Pasgawan Parganas of Mohammadi tahsil.
Mohammadi (East)	Mohammadi, tahsil (excluding Mohammadi atwa Pipardia, Magadpur and Pasgawan Parganas.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The President's Order relating to the Delimitation of Parliamentary and Assembly Constituencies (Uttar Pradesh) stands modified to the extent of the amendment accepted by the House.

Pandit Kunzru: May I know whether this is with regard to the U. P. Legislative assembly also or only with regard to the changes in the Parliamentary constituencies ?

Dr. Ambedkar: It covers both.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We have done both in respect of the Council constituencies and in respect of the Parliamentary and Assembly constituencies. Now there are no more motions.

Pandit Kunzru: Could I put a question to the hon. the Law Minister about one of the Assembly constituencies ?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The matter is over now.

Pandit Kunzru: After considering the matter we have said that one constituency should be a two-member constituency. But the U.P. Government have changed that now. Why has that become necessary? Have they found that the proportion of the scheduled caste voters in the constituency as proposed by them will be higher than in the constituency as proposed by the Speaker's Committee ?

Dr. Ambedkar: I have no information that they have made any such change.

(42)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. the Prime Minister will make a statement regarding the work before the House and the holidays.

The Prime Minister and the Leader of the House (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Tomorrow I believe, has been notified as a holiday in our list of holidays on account of the tenth day of Mohurram. But I understand that the moon did not behave according to the prescribed date and the tenth day has been calculated to be the day after tomorrow and not tomorrow, and in fact that the Chief Commissioner of Delhi has declared day after tomorrow as a holiday on account of Mohurram. I would suggest therefore that this house too may observe day after tomorrow, and not tomorrow, as a holiday on account of Mohurram—that means, sitting tomorrow and not the day after.

Shri Kamath (Madhya Pradesh): Will the session end tomorrow ?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I cannot say that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is so much of work on the order paper.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Let us meet tomorrow. We do not meet day after tomorrow. But we may have to meet the day after that, possibly on Sunday.

Pandit Kunzru (Uttar Pradesh): Why on Sunday ? Why not on Monday ?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We can consider that. Why not Sunday and Monday?

Pandit Kunzru : Our privileges being those of the British House of Commons, and as the British House of Commons does not meet on Sundays, we have every right not to meet on a Sunday.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: The House of Commons, on the other hand, meets on the Mohurram day.

Pandit Kunzru : If the hon. the Leader of the House has the courage to make that suggestion, let us meet on Mohurram day.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru : I am going to show the courage by asking the Ho use to meet on Sunday.

Pandit Kunzru: That is against our privileges.

Shri Kamath: May I suggest that instead of meeting on Sunday we might observe Mohurram festival by meeting and working harder in the service of the nation, just as we did on the occasion of *Vinayaka Chaturthi* and *Anant Chaturdasi* ?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We need not have a discussion on this matter. Tomorrow will be a working day. Though the 12th was originally notified as a holiday, Parliament will meet tomorrow. The holiday will be transferred to a day after tomorrow.

There is so much of work put down on the order paper, and if the Government wants to continue the work, certainly we can sit on Monday and Tuesday also.

So far as Sunday is concerned, normally I am against sitting on Sundays. But we will consider that matter according to the nature of the work, later on.

The House will now proceed with the Industries Bill. .

Dr. Ambedkar : *rose*—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister might make his statement in the afternoon.

Dr. Ambedkar: After this Bill ?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: At about 6 O'clock.

Dr. Ambedkar: It was first arranged between you and me and the Prime Minister that I should make a statement on the 6th. As certain part of the business was not finished on the 6th it was definitely agreed that you would be pleased to suspend the rule about the transaction of business and allow me to make the statement on the 11th. So this is the time when I should make the statement would be read as an ex-Minister? I think he was not told that at 6 O'clock the correspondence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is true that I said to the hon. the Law Minister that I will suspend the rule. Normally under rule 128, immediately after the question hour is over any hon. Minister who has resigned can make, with the permission of the Speaker, a statement in explanation of his resignation. Today I have to suspend the rule for that purpose, and I am going to do it. I am only suggesting that it may be put off till 6 O'clock. That is all.

Dr. Ambedkar: Why not now?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: At 6 O'clock I will hear the hon. Minister.

Dr. Ambedkar: I do not quite understand why my statement should be postponed to 6 O'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Under the rules the Speaker must give his consent before any hon. Minister can make a statement. I would like to know what statement the hon. Minister is going to make. Of course it, involves my consent. I am not disclosing anything to the House which is not provided for, I would request the hon. Minister to give me a copy of the statement and I will allow him to read the statement this afternoon.

Dr. Ambedkar: If that was so, you could have already told me when I saw you that I should hand over my statement to you before you give the permission. You did not do so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no harm.

Dr. Ambedkar: I came and subsequently wrote a letter but so far as I am concerned you did not say that I should furnish you with a copy of my statement before you come to the conclusion that you would permit me to make a statement and so far as I read rule 128, I do not see. that there is any provision therein which requires that a statement should be submitted to the Speaker before he gives consent. The Prime Minister had asked me for a copy of my statement and I have given him a copy of my statement. If you had also given me an order that I should submit a copy of my statement to you before you come to the conclusion Whether I should make it or not, I should have been very glad to do so but you gave me no such indication when I came to you. I felt the difficulty was that under the rules the statement should be made immediately after the question hour and the Prime Minister was very keen that I should finish certain business which it may not be possible for other; Members to undertake because it involves certain difficult matters. I agreed to this and then I came to you and said, "Will you kindly suspend the rules so that I may help the Prime Minister in getting the business through"? You never said that you wanted to see a copy of my statement before' you permitted me and I see that now you have raised this point for the first time.

Pandit Kunzru: May I know whether the Chair can claim some sort of censorship as stated by you ?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, The kind of censorship which the Chair can always exercise is to avoid the matter which ought not to be placed before the House, Which is libellous, slanderous, irrelevant and so on and so forth, (*Interruption*). Order, order, I am only answering the question which was put. I can certainly do so. I am not going to allow observations of an irrelevant nature and improper statements. I will confine myself strictly to rule 128 and if an Hon. Minister goes on making a statement on the floor of the House, I am entitled to call him to order, if I find that the statement

is lacking in decency or decorum or I otherwise regard it as irrelevant. I have always got the power. Otherwise, this rule would be meaningless.

So far as giving the permission to the Hon. Minister is concerned, I agree he came to me. Possibly his memory is short, but he did not suggest to me that under the rules I can suspend the standing orders. I wanted to accommodate him and said I would allow him to make a statement at any time that he liked and I brought to his notice that I can suspend the order. He agreed. Even now during the course of his statement if I do not agree and if I feel that a particular statement ought not to be made. I can certainly ask that portion to be erased from the proceedings of the house. In order to avoid all this. I would like to know what exactly the statement is. It is not going beyond the rules and the scope of my powers. I am prepared to allow him to make a statement suspending the rule, that immediately after the question hour the statement may be made. It still stands. I am not going behind that position and as it is open to me while the Hon. Minister is making a statement, to see that this kind of matter ought not to be stated on the floor of the House. I only asked him, now that there is time, to give me a copy of the statement. I learn that he has given a copy to the Prime minister, the Leader of the House. But to the hands of the Speaker the entire privilege of the house, the honour, the decorum and everything is entrusted. Therefore there ought to be no difference so far as the Speaker is concerned in this matter. I am not going out of the way. I am trying to exercise my powers without prejudice either to the dignity of the house or of the hon. Members with regard to the freedom of making a statement. I will allow the Hon. Minister to make the statement at 6 O'clock.

Shri Kamath: Is it not a fact that under the rules a Minister or a Member may be called to order on the ground of irrelevance or otherwise, but that the statement should not be pre-censored?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is not so, I think under the rules I am entitled to see what is the statement that the Hon Minister is going to make now.

Dr. Ambedkar: I take it that you do not wish me to make a statement that is how I interpret your ruling. I am no longer a Minister. I am going out. I am not going to submit myself to this kind of dictation.

Pandit Kunzru : May I know when Shri Shyama Prasad Mookerjee resigned if he was asked by the Speaker to be supplied with a copy of the statement before he made it in the House ?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: He had a talk with the Hon. Speaker and he told him what he intended to state on the floor of the House.

All that was discussed in the House. The House will now proceed with the next business.

Pandit Kunzru: A copy of the speech was not supplied to him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That was not necessary.

Shri Kamath: We have been deprived of the statement anyway.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It was left to him. Hon. Members are now told that he is not going to make a statement.

(43)

***DR. AMBEDKAR'S LETTER OF RESIGNATION**

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I said that at Six O'clock Dr. Ambedkar may make his statement if he likes. I do not find him in his seat. Under the rules, immediately after the question hour is over, any hon. Minister who has resigned can, with the consent of the Speaker, be allowed to make a statement. To-day the question hour was over this morning after the short-notice question and Dr. Ambedkar piloted the Delimitation of Constituencies Motions and that is why it could not be done immediately when he wanted to make a statement. Thereafter, I thought, in keeping with the practice, either he may do it immediately after the questions or at the close of the day at Six O'clock. Therefore I fixed 6 O'clock. I would be only too glad to give him an opportunity now, but he is not here.

6-00 P.M.

As regards the copy of his statement, it is true when he wanted to make an oral statement, at the time he approached me in the Chamber, I could not anticipate and ask him to put the thing in writing and give it me. It was not right. Therefore I allowed him to make a statement and even said that I would suspend the rules, if he could not make the statement immediately after the question hour. But this morning I found that what he wanted to make by way of a statement, he had put it in writing and had given a copy to the Prime Minister, who is also the Leader of the House. Naturally, I sent word through the Secretary, sufficiently in advance or long before he rose to make his statement, to send me a copy of the statement. I am sorry to say that he would not furnish me with a copy. I do not know why. I have to regulate the debate ; not that I wanted to interfere with the statement at all. When any statement is read before

the house usually the person gives me a copy. I do not know the reasons why he declined to do so.

When he wanted to make a statement I said that he may make a statement without any reserve at 6 O'clock but he did not choose to do so. I am, therefore, sorry that he did not avail himself of the opportunity. I wanted to clear a misunderstanding. I had also asked him before he stood on his legs to furnish me with a copy, which unfortunately he could not furnish. At 6 O'clock whether he furnished me with a copy of the statement or not I would have allowed him to make a statement orally in this House. He has not chosen to do so.

Shri Jnani Ram (Bihar): The statement has already appeared in the press.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not know. The House will not take any notice of it. .

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): May I say a few words in this connection. It is a matter of regret to me, if for no other reason, for the fact that an old colleague should part company in the way that he has done today. I do not wish to go into the various matters that have arisen to which you have referred. I got a copy of that statement at 9-30 a.m. as I was sitting in my place here, about 45 minutes before he actually rose to make it. I read it with some surprise, because it was not the kind of statement that I had expected from a Minister resigning. However, there it was and it was my intention when he made that statement to say a few words, because it was not desirable nor permissible under the rules to have a debate on such a matter. I should just like, with your permission, to read out the letter of resignation sent to me and a few other letters exchanged before and after.

The first letter which I received from him.

Dr. Deshmukh (Madhya Pradesh): On a point of order, if it was the desire of the Chair to give Dr. Ambedkar another opportunity then I think instead of the Prime Minister making any statement on this issue just now, it would be better to wait to see if Dr. Ambedkar is prepared to avail himself of the opportunity.

Khwaja Inait Ullah (Bihar): We have already got a copy in our hands...

Dr. Deshmukh: If an opportunity is proposed to be given...

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not know whether any hon. Member can speak on behalf of another Member and I do not know whether Dr. Deshmukh has any authority from Dr. Ambedkar...

Dr. Deshmukh: Not at all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Though he might have resigned as a Minister he is still a Member of the House. We expect in fairness that when he asked the Deputy Speaker to waive notice and the Deputy Speaker had agreed to waive notice and fixed 6 O'clock for the statement, we expected him to be here and make his representation. It was open to him to make the statement or not, but he is not in his seat at all. The prime Minister wants to make a statement...

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I wish to read out to the House his letter of resignation because normally a statement by a Minister is related to his letter of resignation.

Dr. Deshmukh: How does it arise, since the statement is not there ?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It arises this way. We have Ministers introduced to the House when a Minister is appointed under the direction or on the advice of the Prime Minister. It is open to the Prime Minister to read the letter of resignation to the House.

Dr. Deshmukh : It is the privilege of a Member to make a statement. If that is lacking I do not know under what rules you are proposing to act and how the necessity for any other statement arises.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is always open to the Chair to allow any statement to be made on behalf of the Government.

Dr. Deshmukh: I do not object to that. I want to point out how it arises out of the situation that arose this morning.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Government wants to make an explanation regarding a particular matter and where all persons are interested an opportunity should be given.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru : As you know, Sir, so far as I am concerned I was expecting him to make his statement and if I may say so with all respect. I did not know that the statement would not be made then or that you would fix another time for it. I did not expect the developments as they occurred. But since this has happened and the statement has been published in the press or is going to be, I think the House would be interested greatly in the letters exchanged. I am not referring to the statement in the least, but I am referring to the letters exchanged between Dr. Ambedkar and myself.

The first letter he wrote to me does not refer to his resignation and is dated the 10th August 1951. It reads :

New Delhi.
10th August 1951.

My dear Prime Minister,

My health is causing a great deal of anxiety to me and to my doctors. They have been pressing that I must allow them a longer period of about a month for continuous treatment and that such treatment cannot now be postponed without giving rise to further complications. I am most anxious that the Hindu Code Bill should be disposed of before I put myself in the hands of my doctors. I would, therefore, like to give the Hindu Code Bill a higher priority by taking it up on the 16th of August and finish it by the 1st of September if opponents do not practice obstructive tactics. You know I attach the greatest importance to this measure and would be prepared to undergo any strain on my health to get the Bill through. But if the strain could be avoided by getting through the Bill earlier I am sure you will have no objection. In proposing 16th August, I am allowing priority to all urgent Bills such as those relating to the Punjab, the Ordinances and Shri Gopalaswami Ayyangar's Bill relating to Part C. States.

I write this because I heard that in the last Party meeting you are reported to have said that the Bill may be taken up in the first week of September. I am sure that that was merely your suggestion. It was not your decision.

With kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/- B. R Ambedkar.

I wrote to him the same day :

10th August 1951.

My dear Ambedkar,

I wrote to you yesterday about the Hindu Code Bill. Today I got your letter of the 10th.

I am sorry that your health is causing anxiety. I suggest that you take things a little easy.

About the Hindu Code Bill, you know that we have a good deal of opposition not only inside the House but outside. With the best will in the world, we cannot brush aside this opposition and get things done quickly. They have it in their power to delay a great deal. We must therefore proceed with some tact and with a view to achieve results. I am anxious that the Bill should be passed in this Session.

The Cabinet decision was, and I think it was recorded in the minutes, that the Bill should be taken up at the beginning of September. I mentioned that at the Party Meeting and they agreed. For us to try to hasten it and bring it earlier would needlessly give a handle to our opponents and create trouble. Also it would be far more advantageous to have it early in September, after we have finished with some of the important Bills—the ordinances, the Part C States Bill, the Industry Bill. If we try to have the Hindu Code Bill before any of these, again that will create a furore and give a handle to others. I think that, taking everything into consideration, it is far better to stick to the dates we have announced and then go ahead with it. We shall be able to do so then with greater vigour and somewhat less opposition. Parliament is going to sit till at least the 1st week of October. So there is plenty of time.

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-Jawaharlal Nehru.

On the 27th September I received the following letter of resignation :

“For a long time I have been thinking of resigning my seat from the Cabinet. The only thing that had held me back from giving effect to my intention was the hope that it would be possible to give effect to the Hindu Code Bill before the life of the present Parliament came to an end. I even agreed to break up the Bill and restrict it to marriage and divorce in the fond hope that at least this much of our labour may bear fruit. But even this part of the Bill has been killed. I see no purpose in my continuing to be a member of your Cabinet.

I would like my resignation to take effect immediately. The only possible consideration that may come in the way of your accepting my resignation is the fact that there are certain Bills and Motions standing in my name and which have not yet been finished. But I feel that my absence may not be felt because these Bills and Motions can be put through by any other Minister of your Cabinet. However, if you wish that I should put them through before my resignation takes effect, I shall be prepared to stay on till they are finished but only till then. For I do not wish to deny the civility I owe to you and the Cabinet. In that event I would request that the Bills and Motions standing in my name should be given priority over others.”

My reply dated the same day, that is the 27th September:—

“I have your letter of the 27th September. Two days ago news of your resignation appeared in the press and I was rather mystified. At the beginning of the session you spoke to me about your ill-health and I know of course that you have not been keeping well.

In view of your ill-health and your desire to resign from the Cabinet. I cannot press you to stay on. I should like to express, however, my appreciation of our comradeship during these years since we have worked together in the Cabinet. We have differed sometimes, but that has not affected my appreciation of the good work that you had done. I am sorry indeed that you will be going away.

I can quite understand your great disappointment at the fact that the Hindu Code Bill could not be passed in this session and that even the Marriage and Divorce part of it had ultimately to be postponed. I know very well how hard you have laboured at it and how keenly you have felt about it. Although I have not been intimately connected with this Bill, I have been long convinced of its necessity and I was anxious that it should be passed. I tried my utmost, but the fates and the rules of Parliament were against us. It seemed clear to me that nothing that we could do could get it through during this session. Personally, I shall not give up this fight because I think it is intimately connected with any progress on any front that we desire to make.

You say that you would like your resignation to take effect immediately. But you are good enough to suggest that you might stay on till some of the Bills and Motions standing in your name are dealt with. I shall look into this matter. In any event this session is going to last only till the 6th of October, that is a little more than a week from today. There is not much room left for priorities during a few days. We shall try to push in your Bills and Motions as soon as possible. I hope therefore that you will stay on till the end of the session.

With all good wishes to you”.

To that he sent an answer on the 1st October:—

“I am in receipt of your letter dated the 28th September 1951, in which you have informed me of the acceptance of my resignation. Since you desire me to continue in office till the end of this session, which I understand will terminate on the 6th instant. I am prepared to fall in line with your wishes in this behalf.

I also like to inform you that on the 6th October 1951 I propose to make a statement in Parliament which a retiring Minister usually does.”

My reply dated 3rd October was,—

“You can certainly make a statement in the house on the last day of the session. I do not know yet when the last day will be. It seems most unlikely that it would be the 6th October.

It, is possible that I might also like to make some statement following yours. I should be grateful, therefore, if you could send me a copy of the statement you intend to make.”

Dr. Ambedkar’s letter of 4th October:

“I am in receipt of your letter No..... dated October 3, 1951.

You have said that I should make a statement in the House on the last day of the Session. Does this mean that I should not make my statement on the 6th. If the 6th does not happen to be the last day of the Session ? I should like to have a clear idea about the day on which I am to make my statement. For I have to inform the Deputy Speaker.

I observe that you wish to make a statement following mine. It is not customary to make a statement such as the one you propose to do. You are free to exercise any right which the Rules of Business give you. Personally I will raise no objection to your making a statement following mine. Regarding your request for an advance copy of my statement, as you know, I am not in the habit of writing out my speeches’ or my statement. So far I have not written out the text of my statement. If I find time to write out my statement in time. I shall be glad to send you an advance copy thereof. How far in advance I am of course unable to say.”

My letter to Dr. Ambedkar, dated 4th October:—

“Your letter of the 4th October. It is clear to me that the session will last at least till October 11th. I informed the House so. If it suits you, you can make a statement on that day.

As regards my making a statement, I have not definitely decided to do so. But I thought perhaps I might like to say a few words on that occasion.”

Dr. Ambedkar’s letter, also dated the 4th October:—

“As suggested in your letter No. 3373-PM dated 4th October. I am agreeable to your proposal and will make my statement in the Parliament on the 11th October. I have spoken to the Deputy Speaker and he has agreed to allow me to make my statement on that date after the business standing in my name, namely the Delimitation Order, is finished.”

That was the last letter, Sir.

***Shri Kamath :** Before we proceed further, may I have your permission to ask whether yesterday, Dr. Ambedkar, who is now present in the House, was informed that the correspondence between him and the Prime Minister was going to be read in the House? It was only fair,—and courtesy to the Minister demanded it—that he should have been informed that his correspondence was going to be read. If he was not informed, the House ought to know why he was not informed. I do not know whether he was informed or not. He might tell the House whether he was informed or not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am not primarily concerned with all that. When the spokesman of Government wants to read out certain papers in connection with this, I naturally allow that. Apart from that, I fixed 6 O’clock for Dr. Ambedkar to make his statement. At that time, he was not present in his seat. Then, all relevant matters relating to that and these letters were read. It was expected ; therefore no special notice need be given.

*P. D., Vol. 16, Part II, 12th October 1951, pp. 4751-53.

Shri Kamath : But, was the other party to the correspondence informed ?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If he chooses to be absent, what can be done ?

Shri Kamath: He left the Chamber, saying that he had resigned. Would he have been permitted to make a statement as an ex-Minister ? I think he was not told that at 6 O'clock the correspondence would be read.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Making a statement is not as a Minister, not while in office, but after resigning. Whatever may be the point of time, one minute after resignation, he ceases to be a Minister; he is an ex-Minister. According to the rules, a Member who has resigned his office of Minister may, with the consent of the Speaker make a personal statement in explanation of his resignation. The moment he resigns and it is accepted by the Prime Minister, whatever may be those rules, I am not concerned with that, when he resigns and wants to make a statement, he does not make a statement as a Minister. At that time, he is only an ex-Minister. I would not allow any surprises to be sprung upon me. If the hon. Member wanted to raise any question, if he had either talked to me in chamber or told me in advance. I would have referred to these matters. Let us not continue this further.

Shri Kamath: May I submit, again, that this surprise was sprung yesterday by the correspondence being read. As Dr. Ambedkar is present today, will you permit him, if he so desires, to make a statement on the correspondence read out yesterday ?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am aware that the hon. Member is quite able to take care of himself. All I wish to say is that I cannot answer hypothetical propositions here. Therefore, if the hon. Member wants to do any particular thing himself, if he himself is anxious or wants to make a statement or do something like that, I shall consider the matter.

Dr. Ambedkar (Bombay): I only want to make just two observations, with your permission. When I left the chamber, I think I was quite sure that I left the impression upon the House and upon yourself that I would not be prepared to make the statement at six o'clock. I think I made that quite clear. I am not asking for an opportunity now, or saying that I feel injured by the prime Minister having read out the correspondence at six o'clock, knowing full well that I had stated clearly in the morning that I was not going to obey the observations that you had made, that I should make a statement at six o'clock. Whether it was justified on the part of the Prime Minister or not I leave it to you, without first informing me that he was reading out the correspondence. That I leave to you and the Prime Minister, because I know there are other channels open to me of correcting any wrong impression that the correspondence might have made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is always open to the hon. Member to change his mind: but I had fixed six o'clock and six o'clock stands. Therefore I was observing that the hon. Member was not in his seat at six o'clock.

●●

(Dr. ambedkar's statement in explanation of his resignation from the Cabinet was distributed to the Press and also to the Members of Parliament which has been included as Annexure I in Part II of Vol. 14 in this Series— *Ed.*)