

MR. SPEAKER : Please listen. This is a very serious matter.

We are unanimous that this matter has to be discussed and debated seriously. It is agreed. But 'how' is the question because I have before me many number of notices under Rule 56, under Rule 184, under Rule 193 and under Rule 197. Therefore, the House has to decide which is the rule to be followed to discuss this.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, you decide.

MR. SPEAKER : Before I give my ruling, maybe one of those who have moved the Motion may speak.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH . Sir, please allow me.

MR. SPEAKER . You take the floor after lunch break

SHRI JASWANT SINGH Sir, do you not want to decide whether it has to be an Adjournment Motion or not now?

13.00 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER : What ruling should I give right now?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH Unless we have pleaded our case..

MR. SPEAKER : You have pleaded your case very effectively.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH Not yet. Sir
(*interruptions*) I have not yet begun

MR. SPEAKER But I think we should decide now. Shri Jaswant Singhji, with all my due respect, as I said, this matter has been discussed again and again. On the question of price rise, every time there has been a question of propriety, every time there has been a Motion for Adjournment. Since in the first part of the question, we have gone by the previous ruling. I think it is appropriate that the second part of the question is also decided on the basis of precedents available with us. So, we will discuss it under Rule 193 at 4 o'clock. Now the House stands adjourned for Lunch till 2.00 p.m.

13.02 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till
Fourteen of the clock*

14.04 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Four
Minutes past Fourteen of the Clock*

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

MR. SPEAKER Well, hon. Member, Kumari Mamata Banerjee, I think you have very adequately

ventilated your feeling. Now, I will appeal that hon. Member may resume her seat.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South) : Sir, I will abide by your request only if I am assured that the prices will be reduced.

MR. SPEAKER : We are discussing this matter.

Now, we will first take up Matters Under Rule 377. We will finish it quickly. It will take only two minutes.

(Interruptions)

14.05 hrs.

At this stage, Kumari Mamata Banerjee went back to her seat.

MR. SPEAKER We shall finish this first. Within eight minutes' time, we shall finish it

14.11 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

- (i) **Need for early completion of Chambal Daal Project in Ferozabad district, U.P.**

[Translation]

SHRI PRABHU DAYAL KATHERIA (Ferozabad) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Chambal Daal Project was started in 1978 on Pinahat in Bah Assembly segment which falls under my Parliamentary constituency, Ferozabad. The initial outlay of this project was Rs. 10-12 crores which has now escalated to Rs. 100 crores. Due to non-completion of this project, crores of acres of land is lying unirrigated. Besides, acute shortage of drinking water is persisting and causing serious resentment among the people of the area.

Therefore, the Central Government is requested to direct the Government of Uttar Pradesh to complete the Chambal Daal project at the earliest. At the same time, the Central Government should meet the shortage of funds to complete this project.

14.12 hrs.

RE : QUESTION OF PROPRIETY OF PRE-BUDGET HIKE IN ADMINISTERED PRICES OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS - Contd.

[English]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh) Sir, I am not able to understand how the business is normally proceeding. We have an agreement.

MR. SPEAKER Immediately after this, I shall take it up.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Why not immediately before this? I am not able to understand how we can proceed with the routine business when there is a very serious matter and there is an agreement on that.

MR. SPEAKER : What do you want?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I can say what I want to say. It is not a question of my responding to 'what do you want?'

MR. SPEAKER : Okay.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : It is also not a question of 'okay' because this is not a concession being given to a Member.

MR. SPEAKER : No, it is not a concession.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I take objection to your references like 'what do you want?' and 'okay'. I really take serious objection to this. From the Chair, the hon. Speaker can certainly debar me from speaking. You can rule me out but you cannot so casually refer to me just like 'okay' or 'what do you want?' Well, I represent a Party here.

MR. SPEAKER : I think, I might have used those expressions due to lack of command over the language or ignorance. I am sorry about it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : It is not at all so when you have facilities.

MR. SPEAKER : I am very sorry about it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I submitted to you before your ruling, that we have moved an Adjournment Motion on the question of price hike. On the question of price hike we had not even begun to explain to you the rationale behind the admission of an Adjournment Motion, when you found it convenient to give a ruling that the admission of an Adjournment Motion is ruled out. Now, you have not even heard why it should be an Adjournment Motion. It is not as if there are no precedents, as if Adjournment Motions have not been taken up on price hike before the Budget Session. I cite to you the example of February 1986. It was an Adjournment Motion of price hike from which the Leader of the Opposition gave quotations of what hon. Somnath Chatterjee or Shri Indrajit Gupta, who now adorns the Treasury Benches, had said. After all, why it should be an Adjournment Motion is because we wish to censure the Government. There has to be an element of censure. (Interruptions)

SHRI PS GADHAVI (Kutch) : Sir, I am on a point of order. Once you have ruled then your ruling is unquestionable. Therefore, this question cannot be re-agitated.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar) : Sir, there should be no further discussion, no reconsideration on this question.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I am not challenging the Speaker's ruling. I can understand, Sir, that the Congress does not know what it should do and it makes all kinds of noise on this question of price hike.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South) : I have also given an Adjournment Motion.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Final. I am referring to the other Members of your Party. They simply do not know what they should actually do in this regard.

SHRI SHARAD PAWAR (Baramati) : We know very well as to what we have to do.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : That is precisely why you are so confused.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : What do you mean? We know much better and we have more experience than you in Parliament.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : That is fine, very good!

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Just because you know English, you try to behave in this manner with the Speaker. This is not the way to behave with the Speaker. This is not how a good Parliamentarian behaves. (Interruptions) You cannot speak in that fashion with the Speaker. We take objection to it. You cannot, you should not and you must not speak like that. It should be taken out from the records. 'Come on, come on, is not unparliamentary. We may not know good English. We are from the North-Eastern region. They know good English because they are from Rajasthan.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Not at all.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : This part of it must go from the record of the House.

MR. SPEAKER : I am the servant of the House. I respect the sentiment of every hon. Member and if what I had said had hurt the sentiment of any hon. Member, I feel sorry about it and I apologise for it. I do not think Shri Jaswant Singh had any intention of casting any aspersion on the Chair. I have permitted him to speak. Now you please allow him to speak. Why are you standing now when nobody else is standing? I have given floor to Shri Jaswant Singh.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I am on the question as to why an Adjournment Motion is moved. The first thing is that the Adjournment Motion is normally moved when there is an element of censure of the Government. You have yourself seen that a large section of this House wishes to censure this Government on the Question of its ill-judged and ill-timed price rise.

The second aspect is that there has to be a ministerial or direct governmental responsibility. There is a direct Government responsibility. It is the Government which has taken a decision. Indeed, they have attempted to tell why they have taken a decision. They say that it is an extraordinary situation that has developed. The Government has failed to explain what was so extraordinary. What was so extraordinary that you could not have waited between 2nd July and 10th July when this House was meeting?

The next requirement of an Adjournment Motion is that it ought to be a definite matter. It is a definite matter. There is a question of price hike. It is very definite. It has been specified and we are agreed about the very definiteness of the matter.

It should be a matter of urgent public importance. The criterion that it is urgent is fully met. If it were not urgent, why should the Government move it as precipitously as it did indeed take action on the 2nd when the House had been summoned and when the Parliament was to meet just a week later? It should be a question of public importance. It is a question of public importance because if Rs. 9,700 crore of additional imposts are not a matter of public importance, then I do not know what is a matter. There is direct ministerial responsibility, we wish to censure the Government and, therefore, we have submitted and we have moved an Adjournment Motion. That was the submission that I wished to make to you, which I am making, again appealing to you, not questioning what you have already ruled from the Chair. I am simply making an appeal to you. Please listen to our concern. Please pay a heed to what we are saying. We do wish to censure this Government and we wish to censure it through a medium which is the most effective parliamentary medium, that is, Adjournment Motion. That is the submission I wish to make to you and if you wish to refer to any aspect of parliamentary precedents, there is a debate of February, 1986 and if you see to what the rules say on this, then you could certainly refer to page 447 onwards of Kaul and Shakhder. There are a number of criteria and precedents. The admissibility of a Adjournment Motion is not questioned. I am also not questioning your ruling. I am appealing to you as the repository of the powers of this House to please examine our concern. After all, at a certain level, in the manner what has been done that has been called into question. Indeed, what has been questioned is the sovereignty of the House, the sovereignty of Parliament through which the sovereignty of the people is ensured, Parliament's duty to play the role of a watchdog,

particularly in financial matters. I appeal, therefore, that our request for an Adjournment Motion be considered by you.

MR. SPEAKER : About the 1986 ruling, was it an Adjournment Motion? My record does not say so.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : I have a reference.

MR. SPEAKER : I have referred to the ruling of 1980.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : You have said that as the first part of the ruling, you did not find the illegality of 1980 ruling and as the second part of it, you have not permitted the adjournment Motion. Therefore, in harmony with the first part, we would like to harmonise the second part also.

MR. SPEAKER : I will give you the ruling.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : Subsequently, you have mentioned that Adjournment Motion on such a matter has not been - I am simply citing the Lok Sabha debate of 21st February 1986. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : It was question of privilege raised under Rule 222. The discussion was also there.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH : It was shifted as Privilege issue.

MR. SPEAKER : On the question of Adjournment Motion, I have quoted the ruling which is -

"However, there is no infringement of rules and constitutional provisions, but it would have been more appropriate to announce this increase in the House"

The hon. Speaker went on to say and I quote -

"Members know how to pursue the matter through notices under rules, for example, Rules 184, 193 etc which should be considered for admission etc etc"

Then, he comes to the final ruling

"I have, accordingly, not given my consent to the Adjournment Motion on the Subject"

This is the second part of the ruling. That is what I have quoted because that has been produced to me. I may be wrong. I do not recollect, in recent past, Adjournment Motion having been admitted on the price rise. That is what I said. If there is anything, of course, certainly (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) : You are mentioning old ruling but while taking any decision, it cannot be overlooked that the elections were held in the country recently and as a result, new Lok Sabha was formed. The new Government

assumed power and just after that people were burdened with rupees ten thousand crore imposed on them by an order. The entire country is eagerly looking towards the House and the Parliament. What is our responsibility? Should we not criticise the Government? Should we let the Government do anything uninterrupted? Agitations and Bandhs are being resorted to in the entire country. People are staging Dharnas and the trains are being stopped. Will this House reflect the feelings of the people or we will involve ourselves in rules only? We want to criticise the Government and you have pronounced your decision in this regard. Had you listened to us, perhaps, this decision, would not have been given. We were sure, as a result of the discussion held yesterday that Adjournment Motion will be taken up but you have given your ruling all of a sudden without listening to us. I fully regard your decision but, please let me know some other alternative to criticise the Government. From any of your action it should not be indicated that you intend to save the skin of the Government, though I know that you do not intend to do so.

MR SPEAKER I have not been endowed with such power

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE Please consider over it. If the ruling party is satisfied with the discussion under Rule 184, we are ready even for that. If the discussion takes place under Rule 184, we can move Amendment for withdrawing all the price hike. We are ready for any such adjustment but Mr. Speaker, Sir, please do not compel us to resort to such measures which we do not want to adopt.

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT (Shajapur) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to raise a question of Point of Order.

MR SPEAKER Under what rule?

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT I want to raise the Point of order under the second proviso of Rule 60 in which it has been mentioned that "Provided further that where the Speaker is not in possession of full facts about the matter mentioned therein" My Adjournment Motion is in regard to price hike of Petroleum products. In this regard, neither our view point has been put before the House nor any reply from the hon. Minister has come but you have given your ruling. I think, it will be a wrong Tradition. I would request you to reconsider your ruling. I would like to quote the entire proviso II of Rule 60 to let you know the whole situation -

"Provided further that where the Speaker is not in possession of full facts about the matter mentioned therein, he may, before

giving or refusing his consent, read the notice of the motion and hear from the Minister and for members concerned a brief statement on facts and then give his decision on the admissibility of the motion."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, neither you listened to our views nor the hon. Minister has given any reply. It means that you are still unaware of the facts. I have formed the opinion on the basis of this rule that you should have provided us an opportunity to speak since you are unaware of our views on this point. The Government should respond to it and only then any decision should be taken in this regard.

Therefore, I request you to reconsider the ruling given by you. Since we have given notice for Adjournment Motion, we should be provided an opportunity to speak.

[English]

MR SPEAKER It is not like that.

SHRI P. M. SAYEED (Lakshadweep) Sir, you heard everyone in the House from 12 to 1 o'clock. If I have correctly understood it was with regard to the propriety of the matter and you have also given your ruling based on your illustrious predecessors' rulings. I have no problem if you are reconsidering it. But after having given a ruling by you. We are going to set a wrong precedent by doing this. And also when you were giving a ruling, you had given details of it. And now my esteemed friends Shri Jaswant Singh and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee have come out with an appeal. One can criticise under Rule 193 also. There is no difficulty, there is no bar on it. You will be criticising it. Otherwise are you going to admire the performance of this Government? You will also be criticising it. Anybody is at liberty to do so. My question is, after having given a ruling by you, if you review it now in the House again, you will be setting a wrong precedent. After having decided by you, it would be opening a flood-gate and there will be no end to it. That is my problem. I think you will have to stick to your ruling and let us take it under Rule 193.

SHRI E. AHAMED (Manjeri) I may just mention the contention of my esteemed friend Shri Jaswant Singh when he said that he wanted to censure the Government by moving an Adjournment Motion. If he really feels to censure the Government, then other rules are very much open to him like under Rule 184 which can be moved either against a Minister or against the Council of Ministers. Here I would like to quote from page 445 of the Practice and Procedure

of Parliament by Kaul and Shakhder. It says :

"If an Adjournment Motion is carried, it indicates more strong disapproval of the policy of Government than a censure against it."

And the hon. Member wants to censure and not the disapproval. I do feel, if you invoke Rule 56 about the Adjournment Motion, it will be only a strong disapproval which you can even do under Rule 193.

They can do it even under Rule 193. With regard to the adjournment motion, the rulings were given by no less a person than the Speaker Mavalankar. Shri Mavalankar has made one of the most important rulings as back as 21st March 1950, which I would not like to read the entire thing. If the hon. Speaker permits me, I will do that because he has been referring to the system and the rules prevalent in the assemblies in the post-independence days. We have a set of rules, we have certain channels of communication as well as opportunities to raise the point, where he concludes like this. May I just read? I quote only one portion. It says :

"In the new set up with the various opportunities and responsiveness and responsible character of the Government be cannot look upon an Adjournment Motion as a normal desire for raising discussion on any important matter"

So if it is a matter to be raised, even without Adjournment Motion there are provisions under rule 197 or under rule 193 and the hon. Speaker has already agreed to have discussion under rule 193. So, I may be permitted to say there is a *mala fide* than the *bona fide* in the matter raised by my hon. friend Shri Jaswant Singhji and in view of the fact that Shri Syed has already made that once the Speaker has taken a decision, a ruling has been made, it will not be proper to review it. It will create a very bad precedent if the Speaker will review it.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Sir the subject matter is very important and we have officially opposed to this steep hike

As regards the timing, you have given your decision. But I would like to remind you that there are hike in administered prices of other items like coal, steel and postal services. I have been the Minister of Communication. This is also done by issue of Gazette notification and that does not come before the House. But if the Government can follow the procedure, what you have missed. I think that would be ideal.

Now, this Government is hardly one and a half month old. They have just been able to form their Ministries and have come before the House, and Shri Vajpayeeji, of course, has got a point because he was removed after 13 days. Naturally, he wants to see that they are also censured after one and a half months.

We being the supporters from outside, do not want to embarrass this Government to the extent of having censured them at the moment. But we are totally with them. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let me finish. I did not interrupt you. It is a bad habit. While I am speaking, if you kindly tell me to sit, I will sit. If you want to speak, I will sit down and you speak.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai North) : Are you addressing to me?

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : No, no. We have officially..

MR. SPEAKER : Just a few minutes ago, the hon. Member spoke about the bad habit.

SHRI RAM NAIK : That is why I have got up. But I have not said a single word and you are looking at me.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : If you have not spoken, I am sorry. But you sit down now.

SHRI RAM NAIK : Now, with the permission of the Chair I will sit down.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down now.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : We are also not in favour of such a steep hike of petrol price because it affects the two-wheelers, three-wheelers and others. We are also opposed to the raising of cooking gas price. We have met the Prime Minister today in the morning and ventilated our feelings. But you have it. We will speak in the House. We will see Mamataji and others speaking. You will be satisfied from our speeches. We will not be deprived of hearing the very strong criticism and jointly, we will try to achieve something. On that I do not feel shy to join hands with you to see that something comes. But do not bring it as a censure motion.

Yesterday, it was discussed. Shri Vajpayeeji said, 'we shall try'. He has tried for one and a half hours of two hours. Now, let us accept a discussion under Rule 193, start the discussion. All of us will speak on it and I also share with what Shri Jaswant Singhji has said.

Though it is not a censure motion. We expect that the Government will take it seriously and react to it in a positive manner, so that all of us, irrespective of party affiliations - as Vajpayeeji has said more

than Rs. 9000 crore burden has been put, it may be more also because many things are coming - we shall come to a decision. I will appeal to Vajpayeeji to accept that contention. Let us start the discussion at 4 o'clock. Enough time should be given for the discussion. If it is necessary you can extend the House by an hour or so because there are many speakers from our side; it should be so from their side also. Therefore enough time should be given. This is my submission to you, Sir.

[Translation]

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ (South Delhi) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw your attention towards two points. The first point is that there are Rules, like Rule 193, 184, the Calling Attention Motion, Adjournment Motion etc. under which discussion on subjects of public interest is held in the House. Different Rules have been framed in order to take up the concerned subject. There is also difference in degree of urgency. Had there been no difference in degree of urgency in various subjects then there would have been a single Rule and debate would have been just for the sake of mere discussion on the subject.

If we review all these rules we find that Rule 193 is the mildest Rule under which ultimately the debate drops out and it does not reach to any logical conclusion, whereas we can make amendments and even make addition thereto during the discussion if it is conducted under Rule 184 for discussion keeping in view its nature of urgency, as has been told by our leader just now. Adjournment Motion has one more additional element i.e. censure of the Government. You should conduct a debate under this Rule if you intend to censure the Government. Voting can also be done under it. In this way, the question before us is to identify as to whether the subject may get dropped out after having a debate under Rule 193 or it is of such urgent nature that we should take it up for discussion to reach to a logical conclusion. It seems that opposition party as well as the alliance parties of the ruling Party are also feeling that the Government should be censured. Thus, it should be brought under Adjournment Motion. Therefore, it is my humble submission that debate on this issue should not be accepted for discussion under Rule 193. It should not drop out. It has become such a serious issue that it is necessary to take the discussion to a logical conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, my second humble submission is regarding precedent. Precedent should be quoted for identical situations because such decisions are taken by speaker in a peculiar situation. The only

similarity which appears is the lack of propriety in the earlier as well as present case. Except this there is no similarity. This 30 per cent hike is unprecedented. The Government has been raising prices earlier also but it used to be 5 per cent, 7 per cent or upto 10 per cent but this sudden hike of 30 per cent in the prices of Petroleum products is for the first time.

The third thing is that this new Government which proclaims to be a well wisher of farmers, has selected farmers as their first target. 30 per cent hike has also been made on Naptha which is used in fertilizers. Therefore, I would like to say that situations are not identical and you should not give your Ruling by quoting the 'precedent' only. It is a different situation and deciding authorities are also different. Therefore, please do not allow the discussion on this issue under Rule 193 by quoting a precedent.

It is my humble submission that a critical situation has emerged as a result of this price rise and in this situation it would be better if Adjournment Motion is admitted and if it is not possible, at least discussion must be held under Rule 184. With this I conclude and take my seat.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh) Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Speaker has unlimited powers. There is no question of challenging your Rulings but I request you to reconsider your ruling.

While giving rulings you may consider the rulings given by the former Speaker but it is not relevant in today's situations as has also been mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition and Shrimati Sushma Swaraj, which I do not want to reiterate. It is a peculiar situation and debate under Rule 193 is not sufficient. Therefore, it will not be a wrong tradition if you reconsider your Ruling but on the other hand it would reflect your sensitiveness to this issue. What you have said before leaving the House for Lunch is also your right. But it would have been better and Members would not have made an appeal to reconsider your ruling if you have listened to the opinion of Members before giving any ruling. Shri Ram Vilas Paswan is the leader of the House and Shri Srikant Jena is the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Sir, through you, I would like to ask them as to what they would have done in the similar situation if they were at this side and Shri Santosh Mohan Dev on the side. In such a situation would you have considered the discussion on this issue under Rule 193 sufficient or pursued the point for a longer period? Perhaps Opposition parties would have staged a walk out against your ruling. Here Members

of opposition party are saying mildly to consider it under Rule 184 if you do not intend to bring Adjournment Motion. But on the contrary they would have not done that and left the House to seek political mileage. We can quote their past conducts and opinions particularly in respect of Shri Ram Vilas Paswan and Shri Srikant Jena. But I am saying the time of the House as the old Members of the House are aware of this. I could not understand the point of Shri Santosh Mohan Dev and Congress Party. I have read in newspapers the statement of Congress Party that increase in the prices of Petroleum products would not be tolerated and proceedings of the House would be disrupted on this issue. Now Congress Party has been alienated. Though it is supporting the Government from outside we will not appreciate. You have made this appeal at the last. Actually the act of Kumari Mamata Benerjee is of course in accordance with the reaction of the Congress party I could not understand the ideology of Shri Santosh Mohan Dev as he said that the Government is new but today its cabinet expansion has taken place for the fourth time. God knows that how many times cabinet expansions have to take place. Shri Somnath Chatterjee had said that it would not happen in future. No one knows about the future of this Government. It may be the last session of this Lok Sabha so this is the only opportunity Mr. Speaker, Sir, please create a new tradition and re-think on your Ruling in order to allow the Adjournment Motion for discussion.

[English]

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE (Calcutta South)

Sir, I am very grateful to you for giving me this opportunity.

I withdraw my *dharna* because of your request. But, at the same time, I have expressed my views to the Prime Minister.

Sir, it is a matter of great concern. There is no doubt about it. I do not believe that the matter is related to any political party, but the matter is related to the people of the country. Sometimes, we have to work above political party lines to protect the interests of the people of the country.

The price of even the domestic gas has been increased by Rs. 30 to Rs. 31. Even in the States, especially in the North-Eastern and Eastern regions, you can see the discrimination. For Delhi, it is something, for Madras, it is something, for Calcutta, it is something; and for Bombay it is something else. You will be surprised to know that this price hike will, in an unprecedented manner, affect all the people including the farmers, the lower middle-

class people, the middle-class people and a large section of the small industrialists.

Sir, I think, you are the best person to judge. I think, this matter, if left only with a discussion, will not fulfil the demands of the main thing and that is why I leave it to you. Even if you allow a discussion under rule 184, it would be better because they have to reduce the prices especially for the domestic gas, the petroleum products related to the small scale industries and the diesel used by the farmers for their pump-sets. I would request that you decided the things. The people of the country are watching us. You should not take it as a party matter. Do not decide it politically. You decide it in the greater interest of the country. I think, you can decide things so that the Government can assure the House that they would reduce the prices of the essential commodities and other related commodities without which the people really cannot live - *roti, kapda and makan*.

According to their agenda, they said that they will not disturb the down-trodden people, the weaker sections, the poor people who are below the poverty line. Now, 40 per cent of the people are below the poverty line and they will be affected. I am grateful to even Shri Indrajit Gupta. I have seen his Press report and that *The Telegraph*, the newspaper in which it appeared is with me. He has said he has also reservations about this. I think on the Government side also, the Members of the United Front are also not going to accept this because if anybody accepts this price rise, they will not be able to show their faces to the voters of this country.

Sir, I am grateful to you also. I may appeal to you to allow the Adjournment Motion. I have given the notice for Adjournment Motion under Rule 56. This is your decision. You can give it Under Rule 56 it is your decision. Otherwise you can allow it under Rule 184 so that the Government can reduce the prices. I do not think the Government will bow down their head here but the Government have to bow down before the people of this country. That is all.

[Translation]

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI (Allahabad) Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question before the House is either to have a discussion on the Adjournment Motion or under Rule 184. The question is very important. All the alliance parties of this Government sitting in this House have differences on this price rise. The Polit Bureau of CPI(M), CPI, Forward Block, Congress Party and RSP are giving their different versions. Except Janata Dal, there is no any alliance who has not opposed this price rise. All of them have opposed it.

It is strange. Ram Vilas Paswanji has also been opposing it but today he is mum. It is quite different that he will have to face several problems as the Railway Minister. I know that it is a question of Rs. 300 crore. This matter is very important. It has not been considered even in their joint committee. The newsitems published in various newspapers have reflected criticism. The impression is that except Janata Dal, the whole country is against this price rise. Where we should express our feelings, where is that forum? Should we go to roads to protest? Do the Government want that the Government and the people should have direct confrontation or should reduce the price hike within its discretionary power and if no, should the Government be censured? It is an important question to which I would like to draw your attention. Congress member Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev has said that his party does not intend to embarrass the Government. But Kumari Mamata Banerjee has moved the Adjournment Motion herself. I feel that Members of your party also have great resentment on this issue. Please let them express their resentment.

In this regard censure is being done but our friend said that censure is disapproved. We did not disapprove it but kept it mild. What is your problem to it? Since, we wish to honour your ruling, therefore, opposition has put forth a very good suggestion that a discussion should be held on this matter under rule 184 and then both the things can be proved through the discussion. One thing is that Parliament should represent the feelings of the people of this country. Therefore, I would like to request you that this House may be given an opportunity to honour the feelings of the people and to express the resentment prevailing among the people. Besides, the Government may also be given an opportunity to rectify its mistake. Though, there is no provision to rectify mistake under rule 193 by the Government but the Government can be given an opportunity to rectify its mistake through an Adjournment Motion and under rule 184. We want that the Government should rectify its wrong doings, wrong policies and anti people policies which have been put forth in an improper manner. This is my humble request to you. Paying due respect to your ruling, I would like to submit that this Motion may be allowed or otherwise bring Adjournment Motion under rule 184. The Motion of Shri Jaswant Singh is under rule 184. I request you that the situation may be controlled. I feel that if discussion is not held on this issue properly in this House, it would badly affect the people's mind in the country. The people of the country are very anxious about it and there is a resentment among them. It

appears from the reports being received that if this issue is not resolved in time, it would cause large scale resentment among the people in the country and then it would be very difficult to control it. Therefore, I would like to request you to take up this issue under rule 184.

[English]

SHRI B.K. GADHVI (Banaskantha) : Sir, I think the discussion which is taking place is far from being relevant to the issue which has been raised today. The ruling which you gave for discussing it under Rule 193 is based on the previous ruling of 1980.

Precisely the issue was about the rise in the administered prices of the petroleum products. All these arguments which have been put forth were deliberated, were discussed and were understood. As far as my memory goes, it was the same point which was taken up by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Therefore, it is not correct to say that you have given a ruling for a discussion under Rule 193 which is not based on the facts or is not based on the assessment of the relevant factors. Under Rule 193, a threadbare discussion could be made. All aspects relating to the hike in the price, its effects on various strata of the society, on the economy, on the farming community, on the domestic side and everything could be discussed, and there is no bar on that.

Therefore, to say that it should be discussed under Rule 184 is just to complicate the matter because, then there would be a question of amendment and there would be a question of division. So, the Opposition Party, by this Machiavellian tactics, I would say, wants to divide this House in such a fashion that the common consensus which we are evolving to oppose this price rise would be frustrated. Therefore I would say that some of the remarks which were passed, were given in a hurry, they should have been given after understanding and listening to the facts and relevant factors. Those arguments are not tenable.

Presently therefore, without wasting much time of the House, we should start the discussion under Rule 193 where a discussion could be taken up and as Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev said, we can prolong the discussion, we can have a full-fledged debate under Rule 193 and there is no bar on it. The Government will also certainly come out with a response and the Government would certainly give cogent reasons as to why it was done, or if there is a room for amendment, if there is a room for revision, then I think, the Government will be pragmatic on

that. We are equally concerned as the other Opposition Parties are, about the difficulties being faced by the entire population of the country—the agriculturists, etc. It is not that we are not concerned about it.

The point is this. To make up a debate on a very limited issue in this fashion and then to find out some excuse that perhaps we are not much more concerned about the price rise and some particular section of the House is much more concerned, is just to play to the galleries. Therefore, I would wish and submit that we would start the discussion right now under Rule 193. Thank you, Sir.

[Translation]

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, first of all, I would like to thank you. You had announced before lunch time that discussion may be held on this issue under rule 193 but in spite of that you are ready to review it. Now the question is whether the discussion on the issue of price rise in petrol and other items, should be held under rule 193, through Adjournment Motion or through any other provision. As a matter of fact, I agree fully with the feelings of the leader of the opposition. We have to see that the feelings of the people should be expressed openly before this august House. We have to see under which rule it can be done. First of all, we should know as to whether there is really a resentment among the people over the price hike of petrol and other items and they are severely agitated. But what the people want. They do not want that this Government should be collapsed. They only want that the price hike may be withdrawn or there should be some reduction on it.

If today, this issue is taken up under Adjournment Motion, we would not be able to do justice with the feelings of the people. If Adjournment Motion is adopted it would mean that this Government would fall. But this is not the decision of the people of the country. They want to give an opportunity to the Government to continue and do something. Of course, there is some resentment among them over the price hike of petrol. People only want that the prices of petrol may be reduced. That is why, at this juncture, we should discuss this issue under any motion other than Adjournment Motion because it would not help in expressing the feelings of the public. As I earlier said, if we take up this issue under rule 193, we would not reach any decision through discussion. Therefore, the people want that the Government should withdraw the increase in prices or reduce it to a great extent. I, therefore,

would like to request you that this issue may be taken up under rule 184 in such a way that either the price hike may be withdrawn or reduced to a great extent so that justice can be done to the common man. If such an action is taken only then this august House can understand the opinion of the people and then they can compel the Government to withdraw the price rise or curtail it to a great extent. Therefore, I would like to submit that permission may be given to discuss this issue in this way under rule 184.

SHRI JAI PRAKASH (Hissar) : The issue of price rise of petrol is related to 90 crore people of the country. Therefore, a discussion should be held over this issue by all parties. If Shri Jenaji of the ruling party also wants that a discussion should be held then what is the problem in holding discussion on it? If we do not discuss it here, people will come out on the roads and even riots can take place. Ultimately, Government would be compelled to reduce the price hike. If the Government does not accept our demand here then who will restrain the people outside? I mean to say that a discussion may be held on it and Adjournment Motion be allowed. And if the Government does not review it then discussion must be held on this issue. Today, there is a great resentment among the people over price rise. They are not ready to listen anything. People would ask us as to what for you are sitting in the Parliament, why you did not fight for our demands in the House. So, my submission is that Adjournment Motion may be allowed on this issue.

[English]

SHRI JAGMOHAN (New Delhi) : Sir, there are the days of dynamic interpretation. You have quoted the ruling of 1988. Now, we are in 1996. Even the Supreme court revises its rulings. The aspirations of the people are now different from what they were in 1980. So, the level of aspirations have changed and the ruling has to be given in the light of these aspirations. As I said, it is a dynamic interpretation of the rule. The point is about the first part of the ruling.

If we read it, the message given to the House for future is that it was inappropriate on the part of the Government to have resorted to it without bringing it here. It would have been more appropriate if the Parliament had taken it up. The Government have not drawn any lesson from that. They have not given any respect to that observation. So, in the light of that, the matter should be reconsidered. There is no harm in doing so. When certain facts are brought to the notice of the Supreme Court again, it reviews

them on its own. An order passed by a Bench is reviewed by the same Bench.

So, there is absolutely nothing irrational or wrong in revising your decision when fresh points are being brought to you. That is the only suggestion which I want to make.

[Translation]

SHRI ANANDRAO VITHOBA ADSUL (Buldhāna): Hon'ble Mr. speaker, Sir, I am a new member to this House. I am not able to understand as to whether a law is meant for us or we are meant for a law. Before me an hon'ble Member said that if the hon'ble Speaker, changed his decision it would become a wrong precedent. I would like to know whether the Speaker is meant for the House or House is meant for the Speaker. The feelings of the people and the House are related to this issue. Uproarious scenes are being witnessed over this issue. An important discussion is going on since morning with the hope to reach a decision. Members of all parties have participated in this discussion. If you think of precedent only and do not allow discussion, it will be a wrong step. I would like to suggest that discussion should be held under rule 184.

SHRI RAMENDRA KUMAR (Begusarai) Mr. Speaker, Sir, my point of order is that how many people of the country know about rule 184, 193 and Adjournment Motion?

[English]

MR SPEAKER Point of order cannot be on a point of information, please

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. KODANDA RAMAIAH (Chitradurga) Mr. Speaker Sir, the discussion is about the admissibility of the Adjournment Motion. There is nothing wrong if the Speaker reconsiders his decision. There is nothing wrong about it and the members have been urging you to reconsider your decision. But then the question arises whether there is a case for reconsidering the decision which is already given. Now, you have given the facts of the case, the House has also given the facts of the case and you have already quoted the ruling of 1980. The hon. Member from the opposition side was saying that the Supreme court has been revising its own decision and why not the Speaker also do it. Simply because some court has revised its own ruling, it is not binding on the Speaker to reconsider his opinion.

MR SPEAKER . It is all right. I think you have made your point

SHRI P. KODANDA RAMAIAH : Now, there are two issues involved in this matter—Is the protest of the Opposition about the propriety of the Government in announcing the price rise when the Session is due or whether it is about the price rise itself or whether it is on both? In either case, whether this Government is in power or the Congress is in power or the BJP is in power, this price rise was inevitable. Probably, the Opposition is more worried or my friends who support us from outside are worried about the quantum of rise rather than the rise itself. Fortunately, the Congress Party did not form the Government and you have seen the differences between the two Members. One Member wanted the Motion to be taken up under Rule 193.

MR. SPEAKER . Please conclude now. I think you have made your point.

SHRI P. KODANDA RAMAIAH Now, what I want to say is, finally there is no case for you to reconsider your decision. The matter can be discussed under Rule 193.

[Translation]

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Ghosi) Hon'ble Speaker, Sir, my submission is that there is a great resentment and trouble as well among the people in the country due to increase in the prices of petroleum products. I would like to urge upon the Government that prices should be increased only to the extent that people can bear—(Interruptions) Let me say my point. Prices should not be increased to such an extent that expose distressful commotion. Steep rise in the prices has created a situation of distressful commotion all over the country.

As the hon'ble leader of the Opposition has proposed that if this issue cannot be discussed through Adjournment Motion then it should be discussed under rule 184. (Interruptions) You can understand the real position if you go through the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business. Please find out such a solution which can satisfy all because the eyes of all the people of the country are centred at this House. The only business of the Opposition and ruling Party is to work in the national interest. I would like to submit that a discussion may be held on this issue under rule 184 only. Hon'ble Indrajit Guptaji and Mulayam Singhji are present here.

15.00 hrs.

My submission to the Government is that the price rise of 25 per cent may be reduced to some extent considering it in the Cabinet and an announcement be made in this regard so that the

people of the country have some relief. The person like Shri Indrajit Gupta is sitting here who has been the Member of Parliament for the last 37 years and Shri Mulayam Singhji also had held higher positions. Therefore, I would like to request them that..

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : He wants to become a Chief Minister.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI : What is your objection to this. It is my humble submission that the Government should ponder over it and take action in public interest...(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Hon. Members, just a minute please. I have a meeting of the BAC at 3 O' clock today. After that I will see whether or not there is a case for re-consideration of my ruling that I gave in the morning. I will come back to the House in 45 minutes time, or even earlier and then I will give my observation whether there is any case for re-consideration or not. In the meantime, Matters under Rule 377 and other listed business on the agenda could continue. But this matter would be discussed at 4 O' clock sharp. I will come back on the re-consideration matter.

Now, Shri Rameshwar Patidar.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377 — Contd.

(ii) Need to provide facilities to pilgrims visiting Amarnath

[Translation]

SHRI RAMESHWAR PATIDAR (Khargone) : Mr Speaker, Sir, Pilgrimage to Amarnath is one of the most sacrosanct pilgrimage of Hindu religion, but today anyone who wants to avail the opportunity of pilgrimage to Amarnath, has to cover it in fear and panick. At every step, there is risk to his life. Last year also, the pilgrimage to Amarnath was carried out in an atmosphere full of threats from the terrorists.

Therefore, I request the Union Government to provide facilities and assistance to the Amarnath pilgrims as are provided to the Haj pilgrims.

15.02 hrs.

(Shri PM Sayeed in the Chair)

(iii) Need to release adequate funds out of the National Renewal Fund for Sick Textile Mills in Ahmedabad

SHRI HARIN PATHAK (Ahmedabad) : There are 15 sick closed textile mills in Ahmedabad city. About

fifty thousand textile workers are jobless and their families are starving. Because of this deteriorating economy, Ahmedabad has suffered many social tensions including communal riots. Huge losses are incurred on nine nationalised textile mills.

I, therefore, urge upon the Central Government to release adequate funds out of the National Renewal Fund so that these jobless workers may get some relief.

(iv) Need to ensure payment of dues of royalty on electricity to Himachal Pradesh.

[Translation]

SHRI K.D. SULTANPURI (Shimla) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, when the state of Himachal Pradesh attained full statehood, the states of Haryana and Himachal Pradesh were created out of Punjab and the electricity generated there was also distributed between the two states, out of which provision was made to grant Himachal Pradesh 7.19 royalty whereas the State Government at present, is getting only 2.19 royalty. According to the ground adopted for this, the existing royalty is five per cent less. As such, neither the State Governments released funds to Himachal Pradesh according to the distribution made at that time, nor the Union Government issued instructions to the State Governments for releasing funds to Himachal Pradesh.

I, therefore, urge upon the Central Government to take action to ensure release of a sum of Rs 1400 crores due to Himachal Pradesh by these states so that there is no hindrance in the development programmes of Himachal Pradesh.

(v) Need to provide compensation to the people affected by sand casting due to construction of Mandira Dam in Orissa

[English]

KUMARI FRIDA TOPNO (Sundergarh) : I wish to draw the attention of the Central Government towards the sand casting of hundreds of acres of land of the tribals by Mandira Dam. Mandira Dam has been constructed in order to supply water to Rourkela Steel Plant. Some thirty-two tribal villages were displaced for the construction of this Dam. Due to this dam there is sand casting in the upper part of the dam on the hundreds of acres of land of the tribals.

I urge upon the Government to give due compensation to the families whose cultivable land is under the sand casting. I would also urge upon