

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"For "Thirty-second" substitute—
"Thirty-third" (1)

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Enacting Formula. as amended, was added to the Bill.

The Title was added to the Bill.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. A. SANGMA): I beg to move:

"That the Bill as amended, be passed."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

17.14 hrs.

MOTION RE. CONTEMPT OF THE HOUSE

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As the House is aware, at about 12.35 hours today, six visitors calling themselves Keshar Sharma, Bhagat Ram Gupta, Anil, Shyam Lal Garg, Mahabir Singh and Ravinder Pal Singh shouted slogans from the Visitors' Gallery and tried to throw some leaflets on the Floor of the House. The Watch and Ward Officer took them into custody immediately and interrogated them. The visitors have made statements but have not expressed any regret for their action.

I bring this to the notice of the House for such action as it may deem fit.

AN. HON. MEMBER: One year.
(Interruptions)

ANOTHER HON. MEMBER: One month. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please please.

Mr. P. Venkatasubbaiah.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): I beg to move:

"This House resolves that the persons calling themselves Keshar Sharma, son of Shri Tep Ram Sharma, Bhagat Ram Gupta, son of Shri Ram Kumar Gupta, Anil, son of Shri P. C. Mittal, Shyam Lal Garg, son of Shri Hazari Lal, Mahabir Singh, son of Shri Chandagi Ram and Ravinder Pal Singh, son of Shri P. P. Singh, who shouted slogans at about 12.25 hours today from the Visitors' Gallery and attempted to throw some leaflets from there on the floor of the House and whom the Watch and Ward Officer took into custody immediately, have committed a grave offence and are guilty of the contempt of this House.

This House further resolves that the said Weshar Sharma, Bhagat Ram Gupta, Anil, Shyam Lal Garg, Mahabir Singh and Ravinder Pal Singh be sentenced to simple imprisonment till 6 P.M. on Wednesday, the 24th March, 1982, for the aforesaid contempt of the house and sent to Central Jail, Tihar, New Delhi.

(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no, no. (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER (Del' Sadar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Pon-nani): Today only.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): I want to raise a point of order.

(Interruptions)

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: I want to say something before Mr. George Fernandes says something.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your motion...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Have you completed your motion?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Yes. (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: I want to speak before Mr. Fernandes speaks.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is a notice of substitute motion.

(Interruptions)

MR. JAGDISH TYTLER: I want to speak before Mr. Fernandes speaks.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Suraj Bhan, you want to move a motion?

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: I want to say something before that

AN. HON. MEMBER: The information you have given is not enough. You must also... (Interruptions)

SHRI KAMAL NATH (Chhindwara): The information you have given is inadequate.

AN. HON. MEMBER: We want to know the names of those who have signed the visitors' passes for them.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: We want to know the names of the M.Ps. who signed the passes.

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I want to say something.

SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar): We want to know the names of those Members who signed the... (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: It is not only the Members also who signed them, but... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him move the substitute motion.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, may I make an appeal to Shri Suraj Bhan that this is a matter that concerns the dignity of the House, the dignity and decorum of the House? Every hon. Member of this House must uphold the dignity and decorum of the House. The House should not be divided on political or some personal motives. I would only appeal to him not to move the substitute motion. The motion given by me may be passed. The motion which I have given may be passed. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Suraj Bhan, please, please.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV: We want to know the names of the M.Ps. who have signed the passes.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down. Mr. Suraj Bhan.

(Interruptions)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Under what rule? I would like to know under what rule this motion is being moved. (Interruptions).

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: I do not know whether you were present in the morning when these pamphlets were thrown and disturbance was

created. You must have seen the reaction from this side. Who were the people who were practically supporting them? It is the Members who were sitting here in the opposition side who are responsible for that. (*Interruptions*). That also you should take into consideration.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: All facts must be taken into consideration. I entirely agree with the hon. member. What is the rule under which this motion has come?

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: They have shouted slogans, they have thrown leaflets. According to the watch and ward...

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am on my legs, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is giving you information.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Before the Minister refers us to the watch and ward, we would like the House to concern itself with certain rules. Then we shall listen to him about the watch and ward. What is the rule under which this motion has been moved?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COMMERCE (SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL): A point of order has been raised here and the hon. member wants to know under what rule this is being done. There are provisions in the rules for this House to protect its dignity and even if there are no specific rules, there are residuary powers available to this House and the hon. Speaker to protect the honour and dignity of this House. If we are speaking, all the time saying that democracy should be protected, the parliamentary institution should be protected, we do not understand as to why there should be any objection to punish those who have committed an offence, in front of all the members sitting here, raising technical points and not trying to allow this House to protect its dignity.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: My point of order has not been disposed of. Under rule 1, there is a List of Business. If there is any change that is being made in so far as the List of Business for the day is concerned, which requires the Government or the Minister of State for Home Affairs to come forward with a specific motion on which also he has made no submission, excepting moving the motion and excepting what you have read, we have not been told what were the slogans they shouted, what were the leaflets they threw, what is it that they did, etc. He has not told us any of these things. Before we come to that motion, assuming there are residuary powers. I would like to know whether the Speaker has applied his mind, whether there has been a suspension of the rules in so far as they pertain to the Order of Business before the House and so on and so forth. I would like to have clarification on this issue from the Chair. It is important. I am not saying, 'You do not bring forward a motion'. I am only saying, observe the rules when you bring forward a motion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Are you opposing the motion?

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I will come to the motion once you have established that it is a valid motion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The motion has been moved and I shall put the motion to the vote of the House. (*Interruptions*).

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Raiapur): There is a substitute motion.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I want to speak on the motion. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On the substitute motion, you can speak.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We want to speak on the motion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Both the motions are before the House. You can speak on the motion.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: If there is a motion before the House, anybody can speak on it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let us hear him first.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Under which rule has the motion been moved? Is it in order? (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The motion is in order. I have already ruled.

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: I will read out the rule. Rule 222 says:

"A member may, with the consent of the Speaker, raise a question involving a breach of privilege either of a member or of the House or of a Committee thereof."

There is a breach of privilege of this House. A member is raising this issue. The rule is there. Even if this rule is not there, the residuary power is available to the hon. Speaker.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am also on Rule 222 which the Minister has now pointed out. (*Interruptions*) The hon. Minister of Commerce has read Rule 222 wherein it says that the Member may with the consent of the Speaker, etc. etc. Then he must proceed to Rule 223. What does it say? It says:

"A member wishing to raise a question of privilege shall give notice in writing to the Secretary-General before the commencement of the sitting on the day the question is proposed to be raised. If the question is based on a document, the notice shall be accompanied by the document."

On the very rule on which the Minister relies, there is a procedure laid

down. So, this matter can come tomorrow morning.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD): I am saying that this is not the first time that the Lok Sabha is doing this. On 15 occasions before, the Lok Sabha had already sentenced such persons. I am saying that on 15 December, they did it; on 9th April they did it. This is the convention in the House. I am not quoting the rule. This rule is already there. We are doing it all the time. Therefore there is no question of doing anything else. This has been done under the supreme power of the House.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am rising on a point of order. You have already given your ruling. But unfortunately, the Commerce Minister came to your help and misguided you. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad gave you the correct guidance. But in between the Commerce Minister, unfortunately for you tried to misguide you. He is trying to convince you that the question of privilege is raised. If the question of privilege is raised, since I myself have raised so many privilege issues though they have been rejected a number of times, I can tell you that the notice is to be given under Rule 223. The consent is to be secured under Rule 222 and only when the consent is given, the question of privilege is raised. When the consent is given, then the privilege motion is moved and then the rest of the procedure follows. It may be that if it is the privilege motion, it might be decided upon then and there or as Satish Agarwal did the other day, it can be referred to the Privileges Committee. That procedure is different. Really speaking, the hon. Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has rightly pointed out that there are different lines on the basis of which the issues are dealt with. I want to point out to you that none of us on the side of the opposition also wants that the dignity of the House should be violated. We are

one with you. It is not a question of the ruling party or the opposition. It is a question of the dignity of the entire House right from the Prime Minister to the Leader of the Opposition. We stand together. That is our attitude. Therefore, in the past, I would just urge the Minister, whenever such incidents have occurred—as someone has rightly said that before the entire House the incident has taken place—two dimensions are involved, the sense of hearing and the sense of sight. We have seen the incident happening and we have also heard the slogans 'you must hold the elections in Delhi'. That was the slogan that we heard. I tell you that our hearing capacity is still normal. Since we heard the slogan, I would say that even if a right type of thing is to be done, it must be done in a right type of way from the correct forum. That is our attitude. And, therefore, in the past even for a case for which the entire country is disturbed, if anybody tries to do it, no doubt the House has taken cognisance of that. They have adopted a resolution and they have punished them. But even while doing that knowing that the motivation was not to create hooliganism but they were disturbed and were under provocation even when an act of murder is committed, when the matter goes to the court of law... (*Interruptions*). Let me complete. I am building up the case... (*Interruptions*). Do not brush it aside like that. I will conclude in one minute. In the past, we have... (*Interruptions*). He has quoted 15 instances in the past. I agree with Shri Azad. If we go by the precedents, we should go... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: In 1979, when Shri Fernandes and Prof. Dandavate were on this side and we were on the other side, it had happened...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I never interfered with your submission. Therefore, I agree with him. We should go by the precedent, and

the precedents very often show that, taking note of the motivation, we have always passed a resolution that till the rising of the Lok Sabha let those people be kept here...

(*Interruptions*)

That is what we have been doing...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have allowed him. I will allow all members.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT (Bharatpur): When he says there is no motivation, I differ from him.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, I have raised a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already ruled out your point of order. I have already said that. Your point of order is not under discussion now. There is no point of order.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: What is under discussion?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The motion, which has been moved, is being discussed.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The substitute motion has already been moved. On that he wanted to say something. Therefore, I am allowing him; it is not on the point of order.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We would like to take our submission on that also... (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have ruled out your point of order. But I will give you an opportunity.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, before the Minister makes the statement at the appropriate stage, I would like you to give your ruling whether the question of privilege has been raised, due notice has been given and you are treating it as a privilege motion moved.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHRIVRAJ V. PATIL: ... Procedure, allow me to say something, which is in the interest of the procedure we are following. I will be supported ... (Interruptions) He has allowed me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will hear everyone. I have allowed Shri Shivraj Patil.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: He is making the submission the third time ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SHIVRAJ V. PATIL: Let me make my submission. If there is any point of order to be raised by the hon. Member let it be raised fully and that point of order can be decided by the hon. Presiding Officer. If it had been made fully, we would have answered it also fully. Now I am reading from Kaul and Shakhder, which is based on decided rulings. It says:

"Where the matter is of immediate nature and there is no time for notice being given, the Speaker has permitted a member to raise a question of privilege without previous notice given."

This is the ruling given by this House. There are rulings given by other Houses also that it is not necessary always to give notice and, under the some provision of law, it can be done.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Prof. Dandavate said there was no motive. If you see the time, it happened at the same time—at 12.24 in the Lok Sabha and at 12.24 in the Rajya Sabha. It was planned. No one can say there was no motive. They have done it in both Houses. It is not in Lok Sabha alone they have done it; they have done it in both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, and they have synchronised the time. So, the motive cannot be hidden. There was the motive... (Interruptions). You cannot say there was no motive.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I said it is a disturbance. I never said there was no motive. I said there is a motive... (Interruptions).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): Before it comes in the House, let us try to resolve it. We want to avoid voting. We do not want it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is all right. Let us not get excited. Everybody is agitated over this. It should not have happened. Everybody is one about it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Everybody is concerned about not holding the elections.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not concerned about your elections and all that.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Sir, so far as the question of the House taking serious note of what has happened is concerned, I am not going into that. I yield to none in maintaining the dignity and decorum of this House and therefore, there is no good being lectured by the other side that they alone are the repository of the dignity and decorum of the House. We are also concerned. The point is, what is the procedure to be followed. Let us not, in our anxiety to do something good, take recourse to a procedure which has not so far been adopted. Therefore, I agree with our Labour Minister that in view of the precedents in the House, in a matter which has happened in front of the House and the Members the elaborate procedure of Chapter XX may not be taken recourse to. It may not be appropriate but if it is under Rule 222 you cannot just brush aside the rules which have been laid down unless one goes to Rule 228. But nobody has referred to Rule 228 at all. Therefore, let us go into the question as to what is

the proper procedure. It has happened in front of the House before the Members. Therefore, we take note of it and in the exercise of our authority as a House, as an institution, we take action in view of the precedent.

Secondly, the question which is really agitating the Members, at least some of us on this side, is the quantum of punishment that has been provided. For that I do not know whether any consultation, any discussion has taken place, whether anybody has asked any of us what is the proper quantum of punishment. That is why the resistance is coming. Why don't you follow the usual method? Sir, the quantum of punishment should not be decided upon because a particular slogan is raised. That is what we are saying. (*Interruptions*). You cannot discuss it with any of us on this side. You decide on yourselves as to what would be the quantum of punishment and, therefore, a substitute motion is being moved. The substitute motion is only with regard to the quantum of punishment and the nature of punishment.

SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV: In the past the culprits had regretted but this time they have not regretted.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: In the past they had always consulted us and we had agreed.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: You don't even take note of us. You thrust upon us suddenly that it is the punishment. If you want to get it done through your voting, very well, get it done. But this is not the way. Nobody can say that they alone are concerned with the dignity of the House. How they are concerned about parliamentary democracy we know that. Let us not be taught by them about parliamentary democracy. We know what is happening in this country.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The procedure I am following here is...

(*Interruptions*).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Let there be proper discussion and let a decision come. We do want it to be done by consensus.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: "Sometimes disturbance is created by a visitor..."

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: What are you reading?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am about the procedure.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: What is the book?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down. After hearing me then you raise it. You can't stop me from reading.

(*Interruptions*).

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We want to refer to it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I say these are precedents and there are procedures:

"Sometimes disturbance is created by visitors in the Galleries in the Lok Sabha. Such a visitor is immediately removed from the Gallery by the security and Watch and Ward Staff on duty.

"At the meeting of Speaker with leaders of Parties and Groups in Lok Sabha held on 18 February, 1978, it was agreed that the procedure to be followed in the event of disturbance created by a visitor in the Gallery would be."

The same procedure we are following now.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: What is the procedure?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The procedure is to make an announcement from the Chair. Now, Mr. Suraj Bhan. Do you want to speak on the substitute motion. You please speak.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: We want to support it. Do it properly (*Interruptions*). We want to support it. I do not know what you are reading from.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Suraj Bhan, you speak on the substitute motion.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, we are supporting that procedure.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has moved a substitute motion. I have allowed him to speak.

(*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No no. I have allowed Mr. Suraj Bhan. He has moved a substitute motion.

(*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have said the procedure. I am following.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA (Cacutta North East): Mr. Somnath Chatterjee has made a submission to the Treasury Benches. Are they considering it?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is all right, I have finally ruled. I have said what procedure we are following.

Now, Mr. Suraj Bhan may speak. Are you going to speak? I have allowed Mr. Suraj Bhan only. Nobody else can speak.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I want to speak on the motion.

PROF. MADHU DAN DAVATE: Minister does not want to respond to the appeal of the opposition—entire opposition. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: (Jaipur): Just one minute.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do you not want him to speak? Please sit down—all of you. Let him speak—substitute motion, nothing about the procedure.

(*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not permitting you. No more discussion on that.

(*Interruptions*).

Please do not record anything.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: On this point may I ask through you the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs why the procedure that was adopted in the Rajya Sabha of consulting all the Members... (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is all right. We have our own procedure. We need not take that procedure here. We have got our own procedure with regard to the Lok Sabha.

(*Interruptions*).

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Is it their problem? It is our problem also.

(*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are not permitting him. Permit him to speak. He has put in substitute motion. Should he not be given preference. I have asked Shri Suraj Bhan to speak.

(*Interruptions*).

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs consulted the Members of the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha. (*Interruptions*) It can be six months. You could have adopted that procedure. Why did you not adopt that procedure?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We need not follow the procedure of other than the Lok Sabha.

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: You should have adopted that procedure.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. no. It need not be followed. Shri Suraj Bhan.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: They will also require our co-operation.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: This is a two way traffic. They will also need our cooperation.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-TARY AFFAIRS AND WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH): I am not to consult. It is for the Speaker. (Interruptions).

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: In the Business Advisory Committee they will require our co-operation. In maintaining the quorum they will require our cooperation. At every stage they will need our co-operation. Remember that and then proceed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Suraj Bhan. You can speak on your substitute motion.

श्री सूरजभान (अंबाला): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हाउस की डिग्नटी का मैं उतना ही ध्यान रखता हूँ, जितना आदरणीय सुब्बैया साहब रखते हैं और उसी डिग्नटी को मद्दे-नजर रखते हुए मैंने यह सब्स्टीट्यूट मोशन दिया है। मेरा मोशन यह है—

I beg to move:

“This House does not approve the slogan shouting and throwing of leaflets in the house to-day by the outsiders from visitors gallery and lets them off with warning.”

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज सुबह जो घटना हुई है, उसको मैं ठीक नहीं साभता हूँ लेकिन यह क्यों हुआ, इस बात पर भी हमें विचार करना चाहिए। (व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं समझता हूँ कि इस घटना के लिए...। (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him move the substitute motion.

(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will allow you to speak. Please, please, I will call you. Please sit down.

श्री सूरजभान: इस घटना के लिए केन्द्र सरकार उन नौजवानों से ज्यादा जिम्मेदार है जो ढाई साल से दिल्ली में चुनाव नहीं करवा रही है। ये डेमोक्रेसी की दुहाई देने वाले राजधानी में इलेक्शन नहीं करवा रहे हैं।

(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You talk about your substitute motion. Now the speech is not required. Why do you go into the details of that. Do not make political speech here. You speak on your substitute motion as to what you want. You want to be lenient. Do not bring in what they have said. No, no, I am not going to allow.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You said you will allow me. Why can't you allow me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am going to call you. Let him complete it.

SHRI SURAJ BHAN: There must be some reason for that.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दिल्ली में अफसरशाही चल रही है और यह पब्लिक और पब्लिक के नुमाइंदों के लिए ठीक बात नहीं कही जा सकती। इस ओर हमें विचार करना चाहिए। अगर आप मक्खियां मच्छर हटाना चाहते हैं तो पहले गंदगी को हटाना चाहिए। इसलिए दिल्ली में इलेक्शन करवाइए।

(व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You stick to the motion. I am not going to allow. Do not bring any political

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

speech here. I will not allow political speeches on this issue. I do not want that.

श्री सूरजभान: इसीलिए मैं इस बैकग्राउंड के आधार पर कहता हूँ कि उनको ज्यादा से ज्यादा आज तक की सजा देकर वार्निंग देकर छोड़ दिया जाए ।

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: You said you will allow me to speak on the motion.

SHRI RAJESH PILOT: Sir, I had asked for special permission to speak on the subject purely because this concerns all of us. They are also commenting and they are also saying that this concerns all of us. What I want to bring to your notice today is that this is a planned move. Firstly, we would like to know who are the MPs who have signed the visitors' cards? For one reason, we are told that when we get a visitor inside Parliament, we have got to sign on two registers, one on the pass, one on the register when he gets a pass; and after this, I would like to know who are the Members of Parliament who have done it here, because I feel that it has been planned in a very systematic way. Timing has been given, same time in Rajya Sabha and same time in Lok Sabha; well, they have played it, and it is up to them. But what I would request you to consider is this. Today, it is a leaflet; tomorrow, they will do something else, they will jump from there on us. So, if we do not take any measures and we do not become strict, and do not take any disciplinary action against it, it will become haywire and it will become a public platform, not this Parliament. I would request you and I would request all my senior colleagues sitting here, that for this, there is no controversy and there is no discussion needed, and let us take the most serious action on it so that in future people realise it. Otherwise, today there are four, tomorrow there will be fifty here, and one day we may be hardly 50 sitting here and hundred

people from there will catch hold of us, (*Interruptions*); sometimes, quorum is not there, and we may be ten people sitting here. So, I would request you that we must take the strict and most severe action on it.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री: हमें भी बोलने का मौका मिलना चाहिये ।

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, so far as maintaining the dignity of the House is concerned, there are no two views. I do not see why there should be so much of heat on this question. (*Interruptions*) There is an understanding and there is a unity on both sides of the House that the dignity of the House should be maintained. There are no two views. But, sir, the question is, are you going to look into the reasons that might have prompted.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not concerned about it, I am not concerned about the reasons.

SHRI K. MAYATHEVAR (Dindigul): If you go into the reasons, they will be put in the dock. They will be in trouble. (*Interruptions.*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not concerned with the reasons, the methods and the other things. You have said the right thing that the dignity must be maintained. You should not go beyond that. (*Interruptions*). No. Mr. George, you are creating a very wrong precedent. I am sorry, I am not allowing you to speak. (*Interruptions.*)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Sir, you must listen to me. You are taking all the.....(*Interruptions.*)

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: Even when we were in power we were not behaving like this ..(*Interruptions.*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I now put the substitute motion moved by Shri Suraj Bhan to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"This House does not approve the slogan shouting and throwing of leaflets in the House today by the outsiders from the Visitors' Gallery and lets them off with warning."

Those who are in favour may say, Aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Those who are against may say, No.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think the 'Noes' have it

(Interruptions.)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The 'Ayes' have it..

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, this is a substitute motion.

You have to make (Interruptions.)

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Sir, I would request you to put the substitute motion again for the vote of the House. (Interruptions.)

SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Sir, you put the substitute motion moved by Shri Suraj Bhan. They said 'Aye'. They said 'Aye'.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will put the substitute motion moved by Shri Suraj Bhan to vote again.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"This House does not approve the slogan shouting and throwing of leaflets in the House today by the outsiders from the Visitors' Gallery and lets them off with warning."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Those in favour may say, Aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Those against may say, No.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think, the "Noes" have it, the 'Noes' have it, the substitute motion is. . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The "Ayes" have it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let the Lobbies be cleared.

(Interruptions)

The Lobbies have been cleared.

The question is:

"This House does not approve the slogan shouting and throwing of leaflets in the House today by the outsiders from the Visitors' Gallery and lets them off with warning."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I put the motion moved by Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah to vote.

The question is:

"This House resolves that the persons calling themselves Keshar Sharma son of Shri Tej Ram Sharma, Bhagat Ram Gupta son of Shri Ram Kumar Gupta, Anil son of Shri P. C. Mittal, Shyam Lal Garg son of Shri Hazari Lal, Mahabir Singh son of Shri Chandagi Ram and Ravinder Pal Singh son of Shri P. P. Singh, who shouted slogans at about 12.35 hours today from the visitors' Gallery and attempted to throw some leaflets from there on the floor of the House and whom the watch and Ward Officer took into custody immediately, have committed a grave offence and are guilty of the contempt of this House.

This House further resolves that the said Keshar Sharma, Bhagat Ram

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Gupta, Anil, Shyam Lal Garg, Mahabir Singh and Ravinder Pal Singh be sentenced to simple imprisonment till 6 p.m. on Wednesday, the 24th March, 1982, for the aforesaid contempt of the House and sent to Central Jail, Tihar, New Delhi."

The motion was adopted.

(Interruptions)

[At this stage, some hon. Members left the House.]

17.55 hrs.

ARCHITECTS (AMENDMENT) BILL

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRIES OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL): I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend the Architects Act, 1972, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Architects Act, 1972, came into force on 1st September, 1972, in order to protect the title of the Architect. In this Act which is to provide for registration of architects and matters connected therewith, Section, 44(3) of the Act makes the laying of the Rules framed thereunder on the Table of both Houses of Parliament obligatory. However, the Council of Architecture, which has been constituted as per Section 3 of the Act is also empowered to make regulations with the approval of the Central Government. This does not, however, provide for the regulations so made being laid on the Table of Parliament.

The Committee on Subordinate Legislation of the 6th Lok Sabha, in its Seventh Report has recommended that like rules, regulations framed by the Subordinate bodies under delegated powers authorised by the concerned

Acts of Parliament also should be laid before each House of Parliament and there should be a provision to this effect in the relevant Statutes. Likewise, there should invariably be provision in the relevant Statutes for publication of regulations to be framed thereunder in the Gazette of India. The Government has accepted these recommendations of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation. It is, therefore, proposed to amend the Act as follows:—

In Section 45 of the Architects Act, 1972— 20 of 1972 —

(i) in sub-section (1), after the words 'the Central Government', the words 'by notification in the Official Gazette' shall be inserted.

(ii) After Sub-Section (2), the following sub-Section shall be inserted namely— '(3) Every regulation made under this Section shall be laid, as soon as may be after it is made, before each House of Parliament, while it is in Session for a total period of thirty days which may be comprised in one Session or in two or more successive Sessions and if, before the expiry of the Session, immediately following the Session or the successive Sessions aforesaid, both House agree in making any modification in the regulation, or both Houses agree that the regulation should not be made, the regulation shall thereafter have effect only in such modified form or be of no effect, as the case may be; so, however, that any such modification or annulment shall be without prejudice to the validity of anything previously done under that regulation."

The Architects (Amendment) Bill, 1980, was passed by the Rajya Sabha on the 3rd December, 1980. The Bill as passed by the Rajya Sabha was laid on the Table of Lok Sabha on 8th December, 1980. The amendments contained in the Bill are in consonance