

# **RULES COMMITTEE**

## **THIRD REPORT**

**(FOURTH LOK SABHA)**

**(Laid on the Table on the 1st August, 1967)**



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*August, 1967  
Price: 40 Paise*

328-37R  
K7

# CONTENTS

## PAGE

1. Personnel of the Rules Committee . . . . .	(iii)
2. Report . . . . .	1
3. Appendix . . . . .	4
4. Minutes . . . . .	6

PARLIAMENTARY LIBRARY  
 (Library of the House of Commons)  
 General Publications  
 Acc. No. 28206 (4)  
 Date 4-8-67

1506 (D) LS-1.

328.37R  
 K7

1

## **PERSONNEL OF THE RULES COMMITTEE**

1. Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy—*Chairman*
2. Shri Indrajit Gupta
3. Shri Kanwar Lal 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. Shakdher—*Secretary.*

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

## THIRD REPORT OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

The Rules Committee held their sittings on the 10th, 19th and 24th July, 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 Third 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. *Rules 34 and 54 (Serial Nos. 1 and 2 of the Appendix).*—The Committee consider that in the case of questions also, as has been done in the case of notices of calling attention to matters of urgent public importance by recent amendments to rule 197, where a notice for a question is signed by more than one member, it should be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only.

The Committee further consider that with a view to save the time of the House and to restrict the number of supplementaries to a short notice question, not more than five names be shown against such question. Where more than four members give short notice questions on a similar or allied subject and one of the questions is accepted for answer at short notice, the names of other concerned members, not exceeding four, should be determined by ballot for being shown against the admitted question.

Amendments to rules 34 and 54 are proposed accordingly.

5. *Rule 55 (Serial No. 3 of the Appendix).*—The Committee consider that in the case of notices of half-an-hour discussions also, as has been decided in the case of notices of calling attention matters, and proposed in the case of notices of questions, where a notice is signed by more than one member, it should be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only.

The Committee are also of the view that it is not necessary that a notice for raising a half-an-hour discussion should be supported by the signatures of two other members.

The Committee have noticed that, at present, half-an-hour discussions last for much longer period than the allotted half-an-hour, as a large number of members give their names to the Speaker under rule 55(5) to ask a question each for the purpose of elucidating further information on the subject. The Committee are of opinion that, in order that the discussion should last for half-an-hour allotted to it, it is necessary that the number of members who may be permitted to ask a question each under rule 55(5) should be restricted to four, in addition to the member who raises the discussion. A member wishing to ask a question should make such request in writing before the commencement of the sitting at which the discussion is to take place. Where such requests are received from more than four members, a ballot should be held to determine the names of first four members who may be permitted to ask a question each.

Necessary amendments to rule 55 are proposed accordingly.

6. *Rule 201(3) (Serial No. 4 of the Appendix)*—In the first two sentences of sub-rule (3) of rule 201, the Presiding Officer has been referred to as 'the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker or the person presiding, as the case may be'. In the last sentence of the same sub-rule also a similar expression should be used to describe the Presiding Officer. A formal drafting amendment is proposed accordingly.

7. *Rule 387B (Serial No. 5 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:

"Under article 356 of the Constitution, the President may by Proclamation declare that the powers of the Legislature of a State shall be exercisable by or under the authority of Parliament. On such a Proclamation being issued, Parliament is empowered to make laws in respect of that State or to confer on the President the powers of that Legislature to make laws. When such a Proclamation is issued, Lok Sabha has to pass demands for grants, Appropriation Bills and take up other business which would normally come before that Legislature but for the President's Proclamation. Whenever such Proclamations have been issued in the past (e.g. in respect of the States of Punjab, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Kerala etc.), business concerning those States has been transacted by Lok Sabha in accordance with the provisions of the Rules of Proce-

**Rule 387B as proposed by the Rules**

**Committee reads as under:**

**"387B. These rules shall, with such variations or modifications, as the Speaker may from time to time make, apply to the business pertaining to a State, with powers of whose Legislature are, by virtue of a Proclamation issued by the President under article 456 of the Constitution, exercisable by or under the authority of Parliament."**

dure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, with such  
 modifications and variations as the Speaker deemed fit.  
 In the absence of a specific provision in the Rules of Pro-  
 cedure of Lok Sabha to deal with such matters coming up  
 before the House, the Rules of Procedure of Lok Sabha  
 have been followed in pursuance of the Directions of the  
 Speaker under rule 389 of the Rules of Procedure and  
 Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. The Committee feel  
 that there should be a specific provision in the Rules of  
 Procedure of Lok Sabha which should explicitly make the  
 Rules of Procedure of Lok Sabha applicable *mutatis*  
*mutandis* to the business pertaining to the States under  
 the President's rule coming up before the House".

[4R(RC-3LS), para 9]

New rule 387B is 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.

N. SANJIVA REDDY,

Chairman,  
Rules Committee.

NEW DELHI;  
The 26th July, 1967.

## APPENDIX

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

#### **Rule 34**

1. Rule 34 shall be renumbered as sub-rule (1) thereof and the following sub-rule (2) shall be added thereafter, namely:—

“(2) Where a notice is signed by more than one member, it shall be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only.”

#### **Rule 54**

2. (1) After sub-rule (3) of rule 54, the following sub-rule (3A) shall be inserted, namely:—

“(3A) Where a notice of a short notice question is signed by more than one member, it shall be deemed to have been given by the First signatory only.”

(2) In sub-rule (4) of rule 54, for the words “the names of the other members shall be bracketed with the name of the member whose question has been accepted for answer”, the following words shall be substituted, namely:—

“names of not more than four members, other than the one whose notice has been admitted, as determined by ballot, shall be shown against the admitted question”.

(3) For the second proviso to sub-rule (4) of rule 54, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“Provided further that in the case of consolidated question, names of not more than four members, other than the one whose notice has been admitted, as determined by ballot, shall be shown against the question.”



**Rule 55**

3. (1) For the second proviso to sub-rule (2) of rule 55, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“Provided further that if a notice is signed by more than one member, it shall be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only”.

(2) For the existing proviso to sub-rule (5) of rule 55, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“Provided that not more than four members who have previously intimated to the Secretary may be permitted to ask a question each for the purpose of further elucidating any matter of fact.

*Explanation.*—A member wishing to ask a question shall make such request in writing before the commencement of the sitting at which the discussion is to take place. If such requests are received from more than four members, a ballot shall be held to determine the names of first four members who may be permitted to ask a question each.”

**Rule 201**

4. In the last sentence of sub-rule (3) of rule 201, after the words “the Speaker”, the following words shall be inserted, namely:—

“or the Deputy Speaker or the person presiding, as the case may be,”.

**Rule 387B**

5. After rule 387A, the following rule 387B shall be inserted, namely:—

“Application of rules to business pertaining to a State under the President's rule.

387B. These rules shall, with such variations or modifications, as the Speaker may from time to time make, apply to the business pertaining to a State, the powers of whose Legislature are, by virtue of a Proclamation issued by the President under article 356 of the Constitution, exercisable by or under the authority of Parliament.”

# MINUTES OF THE SITTINGS OF THE RULES COMMITTEE

## I

*New Delhi, Monday, the 10th July, 1967.*

The Committee met from 16.00 to 17.00 hours.

### PRESENT

Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri Nath Pai
3. Shri D. N. Patodia
4. Shri R. Surender Reddy
5. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh
6. Shri R. Umanath

### SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakdher—*Secretary.*

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee took up consideration of the procedure for the disposal of adjournment motions which were not pressed for vote by the mover. The point had been raised by Shri Nath Pai, M.P., in the House on the 5th July, 1967 under rule 377 and, on a suggestion by some members, was referred by the Speaker to the Rules Committee.

The Committee were informed that in the Standing Orders of the Central Legislative Assembly, there existed a provision for adjournment motions being "talked out". It read as follows:

"24. (1) On a motion to adjourn for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, the only question that may be put shall be 'That the Assembly do now adjourn'; provided that, if the debate is not concluded by 6 P.M., it shall automatically terminate and no question shall be put."

The present Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha did not contain that type of procedure. The relevant rules read as follows:—

"62. The Speaker may, if he is satisfied that there has been adequate debate, put the question at 18.30 hours or at such other hour not being less than two hours and thirty minutes from the time of commencement of the debate."

"339. (1) A member who has made a motion may withdraw the same by leave of the House."

The Committee noted that in 1950, the Constituent Assembly (Legislative) Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in force immediately before the commencement of the Constitution, were modified and adapted by the Speaker so as to bring them into conformity with the Constitution, current practice and decisions taken by the Speaker from time to time, for the purpose of regulating the procedure and conduct of business in Parliament. Accordingly, rule 53 (present rule 62) was then modified by omitting the words "provided that, if the debate is not concluded by 6 P.M., it shall automatically terminate and no question shall be put" therefrom.

The Committee were of the view that an adjournment motion involved an element of censure against the Government. Therefore, normally, it would but be proper that there should be a specific decision of the House on such a motion. If only a discussion on a particular matter was desired, recourse could be had to the procedure for raising short duration discussion under rule 193—195 or motion under rule 342.

The Committee considered that another aspect of the matter was that no maximum time limit was fixed for discussion of an adjournment motion. On the other hand, minimum time limit was fixed, thus giving freedom to the House to take its own time to discuss matters of such importance. If a "talk out" procedure was introduced, the minimum time would become the maximum time and, not infrequently, adequate discussion might not take place and the discussion might remain incomplete; the Minister and the mover might not be able to give a complete reply. This was the experience of the Central Legislative Assembly.

Further, in case a provision for the adjournment motions being "talked out" was made in the rules, the temptation on the part of the Government party to see that such motions were talked out and

no decision was reached by the House could not be completely ruled out, as used to happen very frequently in the days of the Central Legislative Assembly. Such procedure might also lead to mixing up of procedures; and the device of adjournment motion might be used for matters which should more appropriately be dealt with under Rule 193 or 342.

Shri Nath Pai, while accepting the above position, pointed out that in view of the following provisions of Direction 44 of the Directions by the Speaker, it was open to a member to say at the end of the debate that he did not want to press his motion in which case it should automatically be treated as withdrawn by leave of the House:

"44. If at the end of the debate, a member who has moved an amendment or a motion which has also been proposed by the Chair, informs the Chair that he does not want to press it and the amendment or motion is not put by the Chair to the vote of the House, such amendment or motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn by the leave of the House."

The Committee decided that in view of the provisions of rule 62 and Direction 44, there was no need to change the present procedure re. disposal of adjournment motions.

3. The Committee then considered the following suggestions made by Shri Erasmo de Sequeira, M.P., regarding 'Question Hour' in Parliament:—

- (i) The House might be divided into two Chambers—one presided over by the Speaker (Downstairs) and the other by the Deputy-Speaker (Upstairs) and the Ministries divided between the two Chambers for answering questions. Members could be free to attend either of the two Chambers.
- (ii) Alternatively, the Question Hour be abolished and a Standing Committee appointed to elicit information from Ministries. Members could send their questions to the Standing Committee.

The Committee did not agree to these suggestions.

4. The Committee then took up consideration of the following proviso to rule 69(1), as suggested by Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications:—

“Provided that where it is not possible to work out the expenditure with reasonable accuracy, the difficulties involved should be clearly stated.”

In this connection, the Committee observed that:

- (i) Government had not given any concrete instances in which it had been difficult for them to comply with the rule.
- (ii) The House passed a Bill after taking into consideration, *inter alia*, the full financial implications of a Bill. The House could not be expected to give a blank cheque to the Government by passing a Bill without considering how it would affect the Consolidated Fund of India after the Bill was passed and brought into operation.
- (iii) A Bill involving expenditure required the President's recommendation under article 117(3) of the Constitution, for consideration. So the Government had to work out the necessary figures regarding the expenditure involved and place it before the President for according recommendation. There should be no difficulty for the Government to give the details of the expenditure so worked out in the financial memorandum, for the information of the members.
- (iv) Sub-rule (1) of rule 69 required only an estimate (and not exact figure) of the recurring and non-recurring expenditure involved.
- (v) The few cases in which Ministries were criticised in the House for not giving a complete financial memorandum related to those in which the Ministries had totally or partially ignored the provisions of the rule.
- (vi) The existing provision of the said sub-rule had been there since 1950 and was working satisfactorily.

The Committee did not agree to the proposed amendment to rule 69(1).

5. New Rule 387B.—The Committee considered the following draft new rule 387B which had been recommended by the Rules Committee (Third Lok Sabha) in their Fourth Report.

**"Rule 387B**

After rule 387A, the following rule 387B shall be inserted, namely:—

Application of rules to business pertaining to a State under the President's rule.

387B. These rules shall, with such variations or modifications, as the Speaker may from time to time make, apply to the business pertaining to a State, the powers of whose Legislature are, by virtue of a Proclamation issued by the President under article 356 of the Constitution, exercisable by or under the authority of Parliament.' "

In this connection, the Committee perused the observations made by the Rules Committee (Third Lok Sabha) in para 9 of their Fourth Report and were in full agreement with the same.

The Committee, accordingly, approved the proposed new rule 387B for making a specific provision in the Rules of the House for regulating the business pertaining to a State, the powers of whose Legislature were, by virtue of a Proclamation issued by the President under article 356 of the Constitution, exercisable by or under the authority of Parliament.

6. The Committee then pursued the lists of categories of subjects on which notices relating to call attention were generally admissible or not admissible (*vide* para 4 of the Minutes dated 19th June, 1967).

*List showing the type of subjects on which call attention notices are usually admitted*

- (i) Incidents which involve a question of national security and unity of the country.
- (ii) Serious food, drought or flood situation in the country or any part thereof.
- (iii) Issues involving maintenance of essential services.
- (iv) Incidents involving a matter of law and order in an Union territory over which the members and the public are greatly agitated.
- (v) Serious developments in States or Union territories involving proper functioning of the constitutional machinery.
- (vi) Serious issues involving production of important commodities like oil, fertilizers, textiles, sugar etc.

- (vii) Issues involving action on the part of a foreign Government which would adversely affect the interests of this country.
- (viii) Border incidents with a neighbouring country which are of a serious nature or where loss of life is involved.
- (ix) Matters involving important issues pertaining to relations between the Central Government and the State Governments.
- (x) Serious incidents in foreign countries involving Indian diplomats or Indian nationals.

*List showing the type of subjects on which call attention notices are usually not admitted*

- (i) Law and Order matters in States.
- (ii) Strikes, Lockouts, fasts and agitations.
- (iii) Terms and conditions of service of employees.
- (iv) Accidents.
- (v) Matter likely to be debated in the near future/discussion on which has already been fixed.
- (vi) Matters which do not involve the primary responsibility of the Government of India.
- (vii) Day to day administrative matters.
- (viii) Frivolous or trivial matters.
- (ix) Minor matters involving normal relations between the centre and the States or between the State inter se.
- (x) Matters relating to autonomous corporations and local bodies.
- (xi) Arrests, searches, confiscation of goods or issue of prohibitory orders under the normal process of law.
- (xii) International conventions or agreements entered into in the normal course.
- (xiii) Isolated border incidents with neighbouring countries.
- (xiv) Communications or messages exchanged between the Government of India and Governments of foreign countries in the normal course.

- (xv) Statements about India made by foreign dignitaries or individuals of which no special note need be taken.
- (xvi) Minor developments about a continuing matter on which a statement has already been made.
- (xvii) Visits of foreign dignitaries or on talks held between foreign dignitaries and Ministers of the Government of India about which communiques are issued in the normal course.
- (xviii) Appointments of Governors or formation of Ministries in States unless a grave violation of the constitutional machinery is involved.
- (xix) Incidents or speeches in State Legislatures or foreign Parliaments.
- (xx) Other matters of unimportant nature.

The Committee noted that the above lists were not exhaustive and the Speaker could in his discretion admit or disallow a notice to call attention on any matter not covered by the above-mentioned categories, keeping in view the urgency and public importance of the matter.

7. The Committee considered the question whether, as had been done by recent amendments to rule 197 re notices of calling attention to matters of urgent public importance, not more than five names need be shown on the Order Paper in respect of each of the various categories of notices required to be given under the Rules of Procedure. The Committee deferred final decision on the matter but desired that in the meantime a draft rule relating to questions covering the following aspects might be placed before the Committee:

- (i) Not more than five names be shown against a question in the Lists of Starred and Short Notice Questions.
- (ii) In case notices of similar questions are received from more than five members, the first five names be determined by ballot.
- (iii) where a notice is signed by more than one member, it should be deemed to be given by the first signatory only.



- (iv) a member's name should not be shown against more than three questions in the List of Questions for oral answer for a day.

8. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Monday, the 17th\* July, 1967 at 16.00 hours.

---

---

\*The sitting fixed for the 17th July, 1967 was subsequently postponed to 19th July, 1967.

## II

*New Delhi, Wednesday, the 19th July, 1967*

The Committee met from 16.00 to 16.45 hours.

### PRESENT

Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy—*Chairman*

### MEMBERS

2. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta

3. Shri Madhu Limaye

4. Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi

5. Shri Sidheshwar Prasad

6. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh

### SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakdher—*Secretary.*

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. Rules 34, 45 and 54 (Serial Nos. 1 to 3 of Annexure).—The Committee took up consideration of the draft amendments to rules 34, 45 and 54 of the Rules of Procedure relating to questions and short notice questions (*vide* para 7 of the Minutes dated the 10th July, 1967). The Committee agreed that in the case of questions also, as had been done in the case of notices for calling attention to matters of urgent public importance by recent amendments to rule 197, where a notice for a question was signed by more than one member, it should be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only. As regards the proposal that not more than five names be shown against a starred or short notice question, the Committee felt that this might be agreed to in respect of short notice questions only and that for the time being the practice of clubbing names to starred questions might continue as at present. The proposal in respect of starred questions could be considered later on. The Committee approved the amendments at Serial Numbers 1 and 3 of the Annexure in respect of rules 34 and 54 respectively and did not accept the amendment to rule 45 for the present.

3. The Committee then considered the following suggestions made by Shri J. M. Lobo Prabhu, M.P., regarding supplementary questions:

- (1) One supplementary might be allowed to only one member of each Group.
- (2) Only one of those whose names had been clubbed to the question of another member might have priority for the question allowed to his group.

The Committee felt that this was not a matter which should be provided for by the rules and calling members to ask supplementary questions should be left to the discretion of the Speaker.

4. The Committee considered Direction 44 of the Directions by the Speaker and felt that this Direction, as at present worded, might give the impression that the House could not record its decision through a vote on a motion or an amendment, if the mover at the end of the debate informed the Chair that he did not want to press it. The House had the inherent right to record its decision on any substantive motion or amendment. This right of the House was fundamental.

Under Rule 339(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, if a member sought to withdraw a motion or an amendment moved by him and the leave was not signified, then the Speaker put the motion or amendment to the vote of the House. But the position was not so clear where the mover of a motion or an amendment, instead of seeking to withdraw it, said that he did not want to press it.

Directions were in amplification of Rules and they provided for matters which were not covered by Rules, but in doing so they should be in conformity with the provisions of the Rules. Therefore, with a view to clarify the position, the Committee recommend that the following amendments might be made by the Speaker to the aforesaid Direction:—

- (1) After the word "and" and before the words "the amendment", the words "if thereupon" shall be inserted; and
- (2) the following proviso shall be added, namely:—

"Provided that if any member requests the Chair to put the amendment or motion to the vote of the House, the amendment or motion shall be put to the vote of the House."

5. The Committee then adjourned to meet again on Monday, the 24th July, 1967 at 16.00 hours.

---

**ANNEXURE**

(See para 2 of the Minutes of the Rules Committee, dated the 19th July, 1967)

**Rule 34**

1. Rule 34 shall be renumbered as sub-rule (1) thereof and the following sub-rule (2) shall be added thereafter, namely:

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

**Rule 45**

2. To rule 45, the following provisos shall be added, namely:

"Provided that the name of a member shall not be shown against more than three questions in the list of questions for oral answer for a day.

Provided further that names of not more than five members shall be shown against any question in the list of questions for oral answer.

*Explanation.*—If notices of questions on the same or similar subject are received from more than five members, a ballot shall be held to determine the relative priority of notices, other than the one which has been admitted, for the purpose of determining names of members not exceeding four in number."

**Rule 54**

3. (1) After sub-rule (3) of rule 54, the following sub-rule (3A) shall be inserted, namely:

"(3A) Where a notice of a short notice question is signed by more than one member, it shall be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only."

(2) In sub-rule (4) of rule 54, for the words "the names of the other members shall be bracketed with the name of the member whose question has been accepted for answer", the following words shall be substituted, namely:

"names of not more than four members, other than the one whose notice has been admitted, as determined by ballot, shall be shown against the admitted question."

(3) For the second proviso to sub-rule (4) of rule 54, the following shall be substituted, namely:

"Provided further that in the case of consolidated question, names of not more than four members, other than the one whose notice has been admitted, as determined by ballot, shall be shown against the question."

---

### III

*New Delhi, Monday, the 24th July, 1967.*

The Committee met from 16.00 to 17.00 hours.

#### PRESENT

Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy—*Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Indrajit Gupta
3. Shri Nath Pai
4. Shri D. N. Patodia
5. Shrimati Sushila Rohatgi
6. Shri Sidheshwar Prasad
7. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh

#### SECRETARIAT

Shri S. L. Shakhder—*Secretary.*

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. Rule 55.—The Committee considered the procedure for raising half-an-hour discussion on a matter of public importance arising out of answer to a question under rule 55. The Committee did not agree to the suggestion that a half-an-hour discussion might be raised only by a member in whose name the relevant question appeared in the list of questions. The Committee felt that after a question was answered on the floor of the House, it became the property of the House and, as at present, it should be open to any member to give notice for half-an-hour discussion for elucidation of matters of fact arising from the answer to the question. The Committee, however, decided that in the case of notices for half-an-hour discussions also, as had been decided in the case of notices for questions and calling attention matters, where a notice was signed by more than one member, it should be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only.

The Committee also observed that half-an-hour discussions lasted for much longer time than the allotted half-an-hour, as a large number of members gave their names to the Speaker to ask questions for the purpose of elucidating further information on the subject. The

Committee were of the opinion that, in order that the discussion should last for half-an-hour allotted to it, it was necessary that the number of members who might be permitted to ask a question each under rule 55(5) should be restricted to four, in addition to the member raising the discussion.

The Committee decided that only those members who intimated their intention to ask questions before 11 A.M. on the day the discussion was fixed should be allowed to ask such questions. If such intimations were received from more than four members, a ballot should be held to determine the names of first four members.

The Committee also considered in this connection the following suggestions made by Shri S. S. Kothari, M.P.:—

- (1) It should not be necessary to specify the point or points which a member wished to raise during half-an-hour discussion.
- (2) It should not be necessary that the notice for raising half-an-hour discussion should be accompanied by an explanatory note stating the reasons for raising discussion on the matter in question.
- (3) It should not be necessary that the notice should be supported by at least two other members. In case it was absolutely necessary to have supporters, the number of supporters should be reduced from two to one.

The Committee did not agree to the suggestions at (1) and (2) above. The Committee were of the view that since half-an-hour discussions were intended to get elucidation on matters of fact, they would not serve the purpose unless the points, which a member wished to raise during the discussion, were specified in the notice. The points specified in the notice enabled the Government to come prepared to reply to all of them during the discussion. Moreover, the points which were sought to be raised during the discussion, were also subject to the limitations imposed on the admissibility of questions. In order to decide the admissibility of a notice of half-an-hour discussion, it was, therefore, necessary that the point or points, sought to be raised by a member, should be specified in the notice. On occasions, the points sought to be raised by members during the discussion, were not exhaustive. It was, therefore, necessary that the notice should, as at present, be accompanied by an explanatory note to enable the Government to understand properly the subject matter of the discussion.

As regards the third suggestion, the Committee agreed that the second proviso to rule 55(2) requiring the notice to be supported by the signatures of at least two other members might be omitted as that was not necessary.

The Committee accordingly approved the following amendments to rule 55:—

“In rule 55,—

- (1) for the second proviso to sub-rule (2), the following shall be substituted, namely:—

‘Provided further that if a notice is signed by more than one member, it shall be deemed to have been given by the first signatory only.’

- (2) for the existing proviso to sub-rule (5), the following shall be substituted, namely:

‘Provided that not more than four members who have previously intimated to the Secretary may be permitted to ask a question each for the purpose of further elucidating any matter of fact.

*Explanation.*—A member wishing to ask a question shall make such request in writing before the commencement of the sitting at which the discussion is to take place. If such requests are received from more than four members, a ballot shall be held to determine the names of first four members who may be permitted to ask a question each.”

3. *Rule 201(3).*—The Committee observed that the last sentence of sub-rule (3) of rule 201 provided: “If less than fifty members rise, the Speaker shall inform the member that he has not the leave of the House”. The Committee noticed that in the earlier two sentences of the said sub-rule, the Presiding Officer had been referred to as ‘the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker or the person presiding, as the case may be’ for the reason that when a resolution for removal of the Speaker was under consideration, the Deputy Speaker or a member of the Panel of Chairmen presided, and when a resolution for removal of the Deputy Speaker was under consideration, the Speaker or a member of Panel of Chairmen presided. The Committee, therefore, felt that it would only be correct to use a similar



terminology for describing the Presiding Officer in the last sentence also. The Committee accordingly approved the following amendment to rule 201(3):

"In the last sentence of sub-rule (3) of rule 201, after the words 'the Speaker', the following words shall be inserted, namely:

'or the Deputy Speaker or the person presiding, as the case may be,'"

4. The Committee decided that a report might be made to the House on the amendments so far approved by the Committee and authorised the Chairman to have it laid on the Table of the House.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

---

©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.

---