

# RULES COMMITTEE

27845

## FIRST REPORT

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

(Laid on the Table on the 9th June, 1967)



सत्यमेव जयते

10-7-67

3  
50

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT,  
NEW DELHI

June, 1967

Price : 30 Paise

328.37A  
ki

**C O N T E N T S**

	<b>PAGE</b>
1. Personnel of the Rules Committee . . . . .	(iii)
2. Report . . . . .	I
3. Appendix . . . . .	5
4. Minutes . . . . .	8

328.37R  
k1

---

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY  
(Library & Reference Service)  
Central Govt. Publications.  
Acc. No. R.....27845...  
Date.....12-6-67...

## PERSONNEL OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

1. Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy—*Chairman*
2. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta
3. Shri Indrajit Gupta
4. Shri R. M. Hajarnavis
5. Shri Madhu Limaye
6. Shri P. Govinda Menon
7. Shri Nath Pai
8. Shri D. N. Patodia
9. Shri R. Surender Reddy
10. Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi
11. Shri S. K. Sambandhan
12. Shri Shashi Bhushan
13. Shri Sidheshwar Prasad
14. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh
15. Shri R. Umanath

### SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Secretary.*

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

# FIRST REPORT OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

The Rules Committee held their sittings on the 26th May and 2nd June, 1967 to consider certain amendments to the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fifth Edition). The Minutes of the sittings are appended to the Report.

2. The recommendations of the Committee are contained in this their First Report which the Committee authorise to be laid on the Table of the House.

3. With regard to the amendments proposed in the Appendix to this Report, the Committee observe as follows:

4. *Rule 33 (Serial No. 1 of the Appendix).*—The Committee have noticed that at present, in the absence of any provision to the contrary, a very large number of notices of questions is given immediately after the issue of summons for a session for practically all the sittings of the House in that session. Thus, questions are tabled months in advance of their due dates of answer. By the time such questions come to be answered in the House, many of them become stale or superfluous in view of subsequent developments. Apart from this fact, they also crowd out or relegate to a low priority questions though tabled subsequently but relating to more urgent, fresh and topical subjects. The Committee feel that a procedure should be devised by which the time of the House is utilised for seeking information on matters which are urgent and fresh rather than on those which are stale and out of date. To achieve this objective, the Committee are of opinion that a provision should be made in the rules prescribing a period before which the notice for the specified date for answer of a question should not be given. After considering all aspects of the matter, the Committee consider that a period of 21 days is most reasonable for the purpose.

The proposed amendment to rule 33 makes this provision.

5. *Rules 55 and 194 (Serial Nos. 2 and 3 of the Appendix).*—The Committee are in full agreement with, and endorse, the following observations made by the Rules Committee of Third Lok Sabha in their Fourth Report\* which could not be considered by that House before its dissolution:

---

\*Laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on the 23rd November, 1966.

“The Committee note that at present members can raise discussions on matters of urgent public importance under rule 193. Such discussions are generally held for 2 hours which is, at times, increased to 2½ hours in the discretion of the Speaker. In the absence of any specific provision in the rules regarding the days and hours when discussions of shorter duration can be raised, members are handicapped in raising matters of urgent public importance for shorter duration similar to ‘half-an-hour’ discussions arising out of replies to questions under rule 55. Consequently they have to resort to other methods in the form of adjournment motions or call attention notices for raising such matters. The Committee feel that members should have greater opportunities of raising discussions of shorter duration on matters of current general public interest. Such discussions can be taken up at the end of the business for the day wherein short speeches may be permitted—allowing a few minutes each for the mover, the Minister’s reply and the mover’s reply. The Committee are of the view that ‘half-an-hour’ discussions under rule 55 and the proposed short duration discussions on matters of urgent public importance may be regulated by spreading them over the whole week. The Committee, therefore, recommend that ‘half-an-hour’ discussions arising out of replies to questions under rule 55 should be allowed on three sittings in a week and a provision should be made in rule 194 to provide for discussion on general matters of urgent public importance at the end of the business for the day on two sittings in a week for the duration not exceeding one hour. In this manner, it would be possible to provide adequate opportunities to a larger number of members who are interested in raising discussion on a variety of subjects, which are of current interest.”

[4R (RC-3LS), para 6].

Necessary amendments to rules 55 and 194 are proposed accordingly.

6. *Rule 197 (Serial No. 4 of the Appendix)*.—In this connection, the Committee perused the following observations made by the Rules Committee of Third Lok Sabha in their Fourth Report\*\*:—

“Under the existing rule, only one calling attention matter can be raised at the same sitting. In actual practice,

---

\*\**Ibid*

on some days, two such matters are taken up in the House—one after the Question Hour and the other at the end of the business for the day. The Committee feel that the existing practice of two such matters being raised at the same sitting may be incorporated in the rules.

Under the present rule, although only one such matter can be raised at a sitting, the Committee find that often a member gives a large number of notices for calling attention on different matters at the same sitting. The Committee feel that there is no point in the same member giving more than one notice for calling attention on different matters at the same sitting. The member giving notice must decide as to which of the matters he seeks to raise is more important than the others. Thus there is hardly any purpose served by a member giving more notices than the number of matters that can be raised at a sitting. Since it is proposed to provide for raising two such matters at a sitting, the Committee feel that no one member should have the right to give more than two such notices for the same sitting. In order to give chances to more members for raising such matters, the Committee consider that the members who have raised the first calling attention matter should not raise the second matter at the same sitting.

The Committee have noticed that often large number of names are clubbed to a single matter of calling attention in the List of Business and considerable time of the House is spent in calling all those members to ask questions on the statement made by the Minister in response to the calling attention notice. With a view to save the time of the House, the Committee feel that it would suffice if upto five names of members giving notice for calling attention on the same matter, in order of priority of receipt of notices, are entered in the List of Business and only those members are permitted to ask a question each for clarification of any point contained in the statement made by the Minister in response to the notice. For this purpose, where a notice is signed by more than one member, it should be deemed to have been given by the first signatory and where two or more notices are received at the same time, a ballot should, in accordance with the current practice, be held to determine their priority *inter se*.

The Committee also consider that all notices which are not taken up on the day for which they have been given should lapse and they should not be kept pending at the end of the day. If the matter is of a continuing nature and a member feels on a subsequent day that it is important enough to call for a statement by a Minister, he may repeat the notice on a subsequent day or days."

[4R (RC-3LS), para 7].

The Committee are in general agreement with the above observations. The Committee are, however, of opinion that all notices for calling attention received for a sitting upto 10.30 hours on that day should be deemed to have been received at 10.30 hours and relative priority *inter se* of notices on the same subject for selecting five names for inclusion in the List of Business should be determined by ballot. Any such notices received after 10.30 hours on a day should be deemed to have been received for the next sitting.

Necessary amendments to rule 197 are proposed accordingly.

7. *Rules 367 and 367AA (Serial Nos. 5 and 6 of the Appendix).*— The Committee find that rules 367, 367A and 367B of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha provide for Division and two methods of recording notes, namely:—

- (1) Division by automatic vote recorder, and
- (2) Division by going into the Lobbies.

In actual practice, another alternative method of recording votes has also on occasions been followed in Lok Sabha and that is by distribution of 'Aye' and 'No' printed slips to members in the House on which they record their votes. The Committee feel that this method of recording votes on 'Aye' and 'No' slips may also be incorporated in the Rules.

An amendment to rule 367 and a new rule 367AA are proposed accordingly.

8. The Committee recommend that the draft amendments to the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fifth Edition) shown in the Appendix may be made.

NEW DELHI;  
The 6th June, 1967.

N. SANJIVA REDDY,  
Chairman,  
Rules Committee.



## APPENDIX

*Amendments to the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fifth Edition) as recommended by the Rules Committee.*

### Rule 33

1. In rule 33, after the words "not less than ten", the words "and not more than twenty-one" shall be inserted.

### Rule 55

2. In sub-rule (1) of rule 55, for the words "shall allot half an hour", the words "may allot half an hour on three sittings in a week" shall be substituted.

### Rule 194

3. (a) In rule 194, the words beginning with the words "and in consultation" and ending with the word "circumstances" shall be omitted.

(b) Rule 194 as so amended shall be renumbered as sub-rule (1) thereof and the following sub-rule (2) shall be added after the proviso, namely:—

"(2) The Speaker may allot two sittings in a week on which such matters may be taken up for discussion and allow such time for discussion not exceeding one hour at or before the end of the sitting, as he may consider appropriate in the circumstances."

### Rule 197

4. (1) After sub-rule (1) of rule 197, the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:—

"Provided that no member shall give more than two such notices for any one sitting."

(2) At the end of sub-rule (2) of rule 197, the following shall be added, namely:—

"but each member in whose name the item stands in the list of business may, with the permission of the Speaker, ask a question:

Provided that names of not more than five members shall be shown in the list of business.

*Explanations.*—(i) Where a notice is signed by more than one member, it shall be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only.

(ii) Notices for a sitting received upto 10.30 hours shall be deemed to have been received at 10.30 hours on that day and a ballot shall be held to determine the relative priority of each such notice on the same subject. Notices received after 10.30 hours shall be deemed to have been given for the next sitting.”

(3) In sub-rule (3) of rule 197, for the words “one such matter”, the words “two such matters” shall be substituted.

(4) After sub-rule (3) of rule 197, the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:—

“Provided that the second matter shall not be raised by the same members who have raised the first matter and it shall be raised at or immediately before the end of the sitting as the Speaker may fix.”

(5) For sub-rule (5) of rule 197, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“(5) All the notices which have not been taken up at the sitting for which they have been given shall lapse at the end of the sitting, unless the Speaker has admitted any of them for a subsequent sitting.”

#### *Rule 367*

5. In sub-rule (3) (c) of rule 367, after the words “the automatic vote recorder”, the words “or by using ‘Aye’ and ‘No’ slips in the House” shall be inserted.

#### *Rule 367AA*

6. After rule 367A, the following new rule 367AA shall be inserted, namely:—

“**Division by distribution of ‘Aye’ and ‘No’ slips.**

367AA. (1) Where the Speaker directs under clause (c) of sub-rule (3) of rule 367 that the votes shall be recorded by members on ‘Aye’ and ‘No’ slips, the Division Clerks shall supply to each member at his seat, an ‘Aye’ or ‘No’ slip, according to the choice indicated by him. A member shall record his vote on the slip by signing and indicating his Division Number thereon.

(2) After the members have recorded their votes, the Division Clerks shall collect the 'Aye' and 'No' slips and bring them to the Table where the votes shall be counted by the officers at the Table and the totals of 'Ayes' and 'Noes' presented to the Speaker.

(3) The result of the Division shall be announced by the Speaker and it shall not be challenged."

---

# MINUTES OF THE SITTINGS OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

## I

*New Delhi, Friday, the 26th May, 1967.*

The Committee met from 16.00 to 17.05 hours.

### PRESENT

Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta
3. Shri Indrajit Gupta
4. Shri D. N. Patodia
5. Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi
6. Shri S. K. Sambandhan
7. Shri Sidheshwar Prasad
8. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh
9. Shri R. Umanath

### SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Secretary.*

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee decided to take up first the amendments to rule 197 regarding calling attention to matters of urgent public importance.

3. The Committee considered the following amendments to rule 197 which had been recommended by the Rules Committee of Third Lok Sabha in their Fourth Report\* which could not be considered by that House before its dissolution:

(1) After sub-rule (1) of rule 197, the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:—

“Provided that no member shall give more than two such notices for any one sitting.”

---

\*Laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on the 23rd November, 1966.

(2) At the end of sub-rule (2) of rule 197, the following shall be added, namely:—

“but each member in whose name the notice stands in the list of business may, with the permission of the Speaker, ask a question and not more than five members, in order of priority of receipt of notices, shall be shown in the list of business.

*Explanation.*—Where a notice is signed by more than one member, it shall be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only and if two notices are received at the same time, a ballot shall be held to determine the relative priority of each such notice.”

(3) In sub-rule (3) of rule 197, for the words “one such matter”, the words “two such matters” shall be substituted.

(4) After sub-rule (3) of rule 197, the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:—

“Provided that second matter shall not be raised by the same members who have raised the first matter and shall be raised at the end of the business for the day.”

(5) For sub-rule (5) of rule 197, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“(5) All the notices which have not been taken up on the day for which they have been given shall lapse at the end of the day.”

In this connection, the Committee perused the observations made by the Rules Committee (Third Lok Sabha) in para 7 of their Fourth Report and expressed their agreement with the same.

After some discussion, the Committee approved the above amendments to rule 197.

4. *Rule 33:* The Committee noticed that at present, in the absence of any provision to the contrary, a very large number of notices of questions was given immediately after the issue of summons for a session for practically all the sittings of the House in that session. Thus, questions were tabled months in advance of their due dates of answer. By the time such questions came to be answered in the House, many of them became stale or superfluous in view of subsequent developments. Apart from this fact, they also crowded out or

relegated to a low priority questions though tabled subsequently but relating to more urgent, fresh and topical subjects. The Committee felt that a procedure should be devised by which the time of the House was utilised for seeking information on matters which were urgent and fresh rather than on those which were stale and out of date. To achieve this objective, the Committee were of the opinion that a provision should be made in the rules prescribing a period from the due date for answer of a question before which its notice should not be given. After considering all aspects of the matter, the Committee decided that a period of 21 days would be most reasonable for the purposes.

5. The Committee decided that a report might be made to the House on the above recommendations of the Committee.

6. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, the 2nd June, 1967 at 16.00 hours.

---

## II

New Delhi, Friday, the 2nd June, 1967.

The Committee met from 16.00 to 17.10 hours.

### PRESENT

Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy—*Chairman*.

### MEMBERS

2. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta
3. Shri Madhu Limaye
4. Shri Nath Pai
5. Shri D. N. Patodia
6. Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi
7. Shri Shashi Bhushan
8. Shri Sidheshwar Prasad
9. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh

Shri P. Ramamurti was also present.

### SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Secretary*.

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary*.

2. The Committee took up for consideration their draft First Report.

3. With regard to the proposed amendments to rule 197, Shri Madhu Limaye suggested that the matters to be taken up for calling attention might be chosen by ballot from among the notices held to be in order by the Speaker. After careful consideration of the suggestion, the Committee decided that the present practice whereby the Speaker made selection of the most important matter to be taken up in the House might continue as, in ballot, unimportant matters might get priority and important matters might be shut out.

The Committee further decided that all notices for calling attention received for a sitting upto 10.30 hours on that day should be deemed to have been received at 10.30 hours and their relative priority *inter se* determined by ballot. Any such notices received after 10.30 hours should be deemed to have been received for the

next sitting. The Committee accordingly decided to redraft the proposed amendments to rule 197 at serial nos. (2), (4) and (5) of item 2 in the Appendix to the draft Report, as follows:—

(2) At the end of sub-rule (2) of rule 197, the following shall be added, namely:—

“but each member in whose name the item stands in the list of business may, with the permission of the Speaker, ask a question:

Provided that names of not more than five members shall be shown in the list of business.

*Explanations.*—(i) Where a notice is signed by more than one member, it shall be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only.

(ii) Notices for a sitting received upto 10.30 hours shall be deemed to have been received at 10.30 hours on that day and a ballot shall be held to determine the relative priority of each such notice on the same subject. Notices received after 10.30 hours shall be deemed to have been given for the next sitting.”

(4) After sub-rule (3) of rule 197, the following proviso shall be inserted, namely:—

“Provided that the second matter shall not be raised by the same members who have raised the first matter and it shall be raised at or immediately before the end of the sitting as the Speaker may fix.”

(5) For sub-rule (5) of rule 197, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“(5) All the notices which have not been taken up on the sitting for which they have been given shall lapse at the end of the sitting, unless the Speaker has admitted any of them for a subsequent sitting.”

4. The Committee considered the following amendments to rules 55 and 194, respectively:—

(1) In sub-rule (1) of rule 55, for the words “shall allot half an hour”, the words “may allot half an hour on three sittings in a week” shall be substituted.

(2) (a) In rule 194, the words beginning with the words “and in consultation” and ending with the word “circumstances” shall be omitted.



(b) Rule 194 as so amended shall be renumbered as sub-rule (1) thereof and the following sub-rule (2) shall be added after the proviso, namely:—

“(2) The Speaker may allot two sittings in a week on which such matters may be taken up for discussion and allow such time for discussion not exceeding one hour at or before the end of the sitting, as he may consider appropriate in the circumstances.”

In this connection, the Committee perused the observations made by the Rules Committee (Third Lok Sabha) in para 6 of their Fourth Report and expressed their agreement with the same.

The Committee approved the above amendments to rules 55 and 194.

5. *New Rule 367AA.*—The Committee noted that Rules 367, 367A and 367B of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha provided for Division and two methods of recording votes, namely:—

- (1) Division by automatic vote recorder, and
- (2) Division by going into the Lobbies.

Another alternative method of recording votes which had on occasions been followed in Lok Sabha was that ‘Aye’ and ‘No’ printed slips were distributed to members in the House on which they recorded their votes.

The Committee felt that this method of recording votes, which was followed in practice, might also be incorporated in the Rules.

Accordingly, the Committee approved the following amendments:—

- (1) *In sub-rule (3) (c) of rule 367, after the words “the automatic vote recorder”, the words “or by using ‘Aye’ and ‘No’ slips in the House” shall be inserted.*
- (2) *After Rule 367A, the following new rule 367AA shall be inserted, namely:—*

**Division by  
Distribution of  
‘Aye’ and  
‘No’ slips.**

367AA. (1) Where the Speaker directs under clause (c) of sub-rule (3) of rule 367 that the votes shall be recorded by members on ‘Aye’ and ‘No’ slips, the Division Clerks shall supply, to each member at his seat, an ‘Aye’ or ‘No’ slip, according to the choice indicated by him. A member shall record his vote on the slip by signing and indicating his Division Number thereon.

(2) After the members have recorded their votes, the Division Clerks shall collect the 'Aye' and 'No' slips and bring them to the Table where the votes shall be counted by the officers at the Table and the totals of 'Ayes' and 'Noes' presented to the Speaker.

(3) The result of the Division shall be announced by the Speaker and it shall not be challenged."

6. A suggestion was made by some members that in the case of questions also, as was decided in respect of calling attention notices, not more than five names might be clubbed to a question. The Committee decided to defer consideration of this matter to a subsequent sitting.

7. The Committee authorised the Chairman to finalise the Report of the Committee incorporating therein the above decisions of the Committee and to have it laid on the Table of the House on a convenient date.

8. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Friday, the 9th June, 1967 at 16.00 hours.

---

---

© 1967 By LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PUBLISHED UNDER RULE 382 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF  
BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA (FIFTH EDITION) AND PRINTED BY THE GENERAL  
MANAGER, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI.

---