

12.03 Hrs.

RE. CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE

(Procedure)

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Hem Barua.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirapalli) : Sir, before you take up the Calling Attention Notice, I have a point of order on that.

My point of order is under rule 197 which reads :—

“A member may, with the previous permission of the Speaker, call the attention of a Minister to any matter of urgent public importance and the Minister may make a brief statement or ask for time to make a statement at a later hour or date.”

The Calling-attention notice says :—

“to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the reported involvement of C.P.I. (Marxist) in anti-national activities in West Bengal and Kashmir.”

Now, rule 197 clearly says that it must be a matter of urgent public importance. A section of the press has brought into contempt a party which is a legal party and which is also a ruling party in many States in India. If whatever is reported in the press can be the subject matter of an issue being raised in the House, then many sections of the Opposition parties or even the Congress Party can be accused similarly by a section of the press. The Communist Party also has got its organs and we can accuse the Congress or any other party in the Opposition. But are we going to use the forum of Parliament and the office of the Speaker for allowing such sort of discussions and be a party to this for bringing in a cold war between the Opposition parties at the instance of somebody who is interested? Therefore I submit that a ruling may be given that such calling-attention notices would not be allowed. Anything can be reported in the press. After all, what is reported in the press is not a sufficient matter for discussion

here. I can give instances of press reports about any party or individual. Tomorrow a pressman may write something about the Speaker saying that he is doing something which is anti-national: Or, the agitation against the Language Bill is an anti-national activity openly done by the Jana Sangh and others. Are we to bring it up here? Therefore I submit that this should not be allowed to be raised in the forum of Parliament.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा भी व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

MR. SPEAKER : I called him because his party was concerned.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह केवल आप का और उनका मामला नहीं है। यह कोई चेम्बर में बात नहीं हुई है। जब सदन के सामने कोई प्रश्न आ जाता है, तो हम सब को उस पर अपने विचार प्रकट करने का अधिकार है। आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिये।

MR. SPEAKER : After hearing you I must hear everybody else.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं इस बारे में साफ और निश्चित निर्णय चाहता हूँ। मेरी राय में तो इस सदन में सब विषयों की चर्चा होनी चाहिये। अगर आप इस ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव की इजाजत देते हैं, तो आप को इस के साथ-साथ इस बात का भी ख्याल रखना चाहिये कि जब बिहार में कृष्णभल्लभ साहाय का मन्त्रि-मंडल था, तो जमशेदपुर में जो दंगे-फसाद हुए और अब रांची में जो दंगे हुए, उनके बारे में ये आरोप लगाए गए कि उनमें कांग्रेस पार्टी का भी हाथ था। इस तरह के बयान अखबारों में आए। (व्यवधान) यह झूठ भी हो सकता है और सही भी हो सकता है। मैंने यह नहीं कहा है कि यह सही है या गलत है। इस तरह के आरोप लगाए गए हैं।

श्री शशिभूषण बाजपेयी (खारगोन) : रांची में जन संघ ने फसाद कराये, जिन के साथ आप ने समझौता किया हुआ है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरी आपसे यह दर-
खास्त है कि इस सदन में जो विभिन्न राज-
नीतिक दल हैं, अगर उनके बारे में यहां पर
सवाल किये जा सकते हैं या ध्यानकर्षण
प्रस्ताव आ सकते हैं, तो आप सभी दलों के
बारे में एक ही न्याय कीजिये। ऐसा न
हो कि वामपन्थी कम्युनिस्टों या जन संघ
के बारे में यदि कोई प्रश्न हो, तो उसको
तो स्वीकार कर लिया जाय और कांग्रेस
के बारे में किसी प्रश्न को स्वीकार न किया
जाय। यहां पर सब की चर्चा होनी चाहिए।
हम किसी भी चर्चा को दबाना नहीं चाहते
हैं।

MR. SPEAKER : One friend of the
Communist Party (Marxist) met me—
I do not want to name him—and said
that all sorts of allegations may be
made and I said that if all sorts of alle-
gations are made, you may explain your
point of view and that also must be
before the House. That is the mini-
mum demand of any party which is
being maligned. But it is nothing new
here. So many times we see that the
Congress Party is accused of doing so
many things. On the floor of the
House it is done against each party. I
wish, you could avoid it. If the
leaders can say that allegations against
each other shall be avoided, I will be
very very happy. But as long as they
do it against each other, the Speaker
need not be put in an embarrassing
position. I gave an assurance to the
leader of the Marxist Party that it shall
not go without his explanation. He
said, "I may not be asked to do so",
because his name is not here on the
calling-attention notice and I said, "If
you ask for an explanation later on,
perhaps I will consider it; tomorrow
you may be given a chance."

SHRI NAMBIAR : Explanation
is not a mercy.

MR. SPEAKER : What do you want
me to do then? May I ask Shri Nam-
biar that he also should not hurl charges
against another party. I will be very

happy, if he does that... (*Interrup-
tion*). Let us decide that from to-
morrow no party shall say on the floor
of the House—outside you may say so
many things; nobody is interested—
anything against another party unless
it is a proved fact or something like
that. Let us have some convention
like that. All the parties may say any-
thing outside. But until this is not
done, it will be very difficult for me
to allow... (*Interruption*).

SHRI NAMBIAR : I never thought
your office will be used for this pur-
pose. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. I
would like to hear Mr. Dange now.

SHRI S. A. DANGE (Bombay Cen-
tral South): Are we going to have a
convention in this House that one
group of MPs can accuse another group
of MPs and their party of anything
they like and you will permit a discus-
sion on that in this House?

MR. SPEAKER : No; it should not
be so. I am appealing to all.

SHRI S. A. DANGE : Tomorrow, I
may give a notice and say that certain
political parties have organised riots
against Muslims in Ranchi or certain
political parties have organised riots in
Calcutta or that they are carrying out
a civil war, that they are permitting
communal hatred, a communal mas-
sacre, and request you to please allow
a discussion on those parties, will you
allow it? If this House is to go into
that through such methods, then let us
have an understanding and we will also
go through it.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South
Delhi): Sir, it is not a question of any
one party accusing another party...
(*Interruption*)

AN HON. MEMBER : What is that
then?

श्री बलराज मधोक : हमारा भारत
देश एक गणतंत्री देश है और लोकतन्त्रात्मक
पद्धति से यह संसद् चुनी गई है। उसका काम

है कि जो लोकतंत्रीय व्यवस्थाएं हैं, स्वतंत्रताएं हैं और लिबरटीज हैं उन की रक्षा की जाए। अगर देश में कोई दल ऐसा है जो ऐसी अलोकतांत्रिक और नाजायज कार्यवाहियां करता है कि जिन लिबरटीज के आघार पर वह चुन कर आता है उन्हीं लिबरटीज को वह खत्म करना चाहता है और आज देश की सिक्योरिटी के बारे में देश की सुरक्षा के बारे में खतरा पैदा करता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि एक लोकतंत्री संसद् होने के नाते, देश की सुरक्षा का सवाल होने के नाते इस संसद् को इस हाउस को उस के ऊपर चर्चा करने का पूरा अधिकार है यदि हम चर्चा नहीं करते तो we will be failing in our duty, we will be betraying our country, we will be betraying democracy, we will be betraying national defence forces and, therefore, we have every right to discuss such questions in this House. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : I would not have interfered in this discussion but for what I heard from Mr. Madhok just now. Mr. Madhok goes on the premise—I want to emphasize that—that there is a party or there are parties in this country whose existence is detrimental to the national security and all that. That is the premise. What I want to know is this. Has that premise been established by any authentic or authoritative evidence in this House? (*Interruption*) Without that, is it open to any Member of this House to assume that there is a particular party in this country whose existence is detrimental to the national security? After making that categorical statement, if he comes forward and says, it is open to the House to discuss that, certainly, I want that evidence to be placed before the House. Let the evidence be placed before the House and let me be given an opportunity, let us be given an opportunity to cross-examine and prove that the evidence is nothing but a string of lies. I want to know, without that, whether the House is going to convert itself into a court of law, where all this will be gone into. If not, I do not see any reason how on mere allegations, from

whichever quarter it might be—it may be some newspaper reports; it may be the Home Ministry's fabricated versions—merely on that basis, we can go into all that. Let there be a proper trial; let there be a proper evidence. I am quite prepared for that. Without going through all that, is this Parliament going to convert itself into a court of law?

SHRI NAMBIAR : Let the evidence be produced. Even without *prima facie* evidence, how can you allow that?

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) : May I say a word, Sir? As long as the Parties are recognized and they have not been banned, I think, there should be no discussion about the credentials. It is for the Government to see if any Party is unfaithful to the nation or wants to invite another nation to come to this country. It is for the Government to deal with it. This cannot be dealt with as a matter of discussion in this House.

SHRI AMIYA NATH BOSE (Arambagh) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, my esteemed friend, Mr. Ramamurti, asked for evidence. May I give one evidence?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Do, do.

SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI : This is not the place for that.

SEVERAL HON'BLE MEMBERS
rose—

MR. SPEAKER : I am on my legs. It is not my intention—let me make it clear—to allow anybody to bring about a fight on the floor of this House. It will be rather very difficult for me. May I suggest now, Mr. Ramamurti, that this thing be postponed?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : So that I may speak to the Leader of the House and others also. Will you kindly—Mr. Amiyanath Bose, Mr. Devgun all of you—sit down?

SHRI SHASHI RANJAN (Pupri) : You should give a chance to Mr. Bose.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : May I understand from you, Sir, that a very important convention you are setting up.

I am not going into the merit or otherwise of this particular calling attention motion. Also I am quite prepared to go with you when you say "Let us sit together and try to evolve...."

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I am saying.

SHRI NATH PAI : But, there is another thing which is likely to come as an inevitable conclusion from your present ruling.

MR. SPEAKER : It is a suggestion that I made, only if all of you agree.

SHRI NATH PAI : Let us understand what we are doing. That will be useful perhaps. I submit to you, Sir, that once it is put on the agenda, *prima facie*....

MR. SPEAKER : The House has a right. I do not want to give any ruling.

SHRI NATH PAI : I never interrupt you, Mr. Speaker, but let me complete.

I am submitting to you with all respect and with all humility that when it was entered and printed on the agenda of the House for to-day, *prima-facie*, it means that you had given the matter such consideration as you are called upon and you had approved it and you had approved of its being included. Therefore, it came. Now, at this stage an objection is raised. This is totally different from a Bill coming from the Government and then an objection is raised on one ground or another. These matters come before the House only when your consent is given. You are postponing its consideration, if I understood you correctly.

MR. SPEAKER : I have placed that suggestion before the House.

SHRI NATH PAI : I am not against your postponement. I am saying that when it is placed on the agenda....

MR. SPEAKER : Now you have made it clear that once it is printed, it cannot be postponed. That is your point ?

SHRI NATH PAI : I want to know that. So, there should be possibility in future—I am not concerned with the fate of this particular calling-attention motion but I am only trying to establish a convention in this House—that it will be open to the Members of the House to raise an objection and the Speaker will be inclined even to postpone an item which has been duly entered in the agenda of the day. Am I right, Sir? I am not going into anything else at this stage.

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : Since the call-attention motion is in my name, I want to make a submission to you. Now, Sir, the purpose of this call-attention motion is not to malign any Party. There is a report and we wanted the Government to establish or reject that report. That is our purpose. Our purpose is not to malign any political Party.

Now, when you suggest that this can be postponed, I have serious objection to that. The objections have been procedural. They have been very clearly stated by Mr. Nath Pai. Sir, if you start this convention....

MR. SPEAKER : You cannot repeat it.

SHRI HEM BARUA : There is a danger, Sir. If you postpone this, then what would happen is this. You would put down an item on the agenda, and then some Member would jump up and say that that must not be discussed, and that would mean that you overrule your own ruling....

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : So many hon. Members want to talk about this ?

SHRI A. K. SEN (Calcutta North West): I want to say a word....

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर):
अब इसी पर विचार करना है कि मामले को
टाक जाय या नहीं। मेरिट में न जायें।
पहले इस पर आप विचार कर लें।

MR. SPEAKER: That was what I had said.

Shri Amiyanath Bose was on his legs and he was going to say something. I had stopped him in the middle. Now, let him say what he wants to say.

I do not want any evidence and all that. We are now only on the point whether this can be postponed or should not be postponed, and on that he could make his submission.

SHRI AMIYANATH BOSE: The point that has been made by Shri P. Ramamurti is this that there should be at least *prima facie* evidence before a notice of this nature can be admitted. I am producing that evidence before this House.

SHRI NAMBIAR: Let him give it to the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Let him give it to the Chair. Will he kindly give it to the Chair? I shall pass it on to Government. It need not be given on the floor of the House.

SHRI AMIYANATH BOSE: Please bear with me for a few minutes....

MR. SPEAKER: Not on the floor of the House.

SHRI AMIYANATH BOSE: I shall not take much time. I have not wasted any time of the House; I have wasted very little time of this House. I believe that in the interests of Bengal, in the interests of India, I must be heard in this House today. In the name of Bengal, in the name of the country and in the name of God, I must be heard in this House today.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We are not going into the evidence now.

SHRI NAMBIAR: Let him give it to the Speaker.

SHRI AMIYANATH BOSE: I give it to the nation. I speak here because my word must travel beyond the four corners of this House and it must travel to the four corners of the nation. I say that my words uttered on the floor of the House must travel to the whole nation.. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. Member kindly sit down?

SHRI AMIYANATH BOSE: I shall not sit down till you order me to sit down....

SHRI V. KRISHNAMOORTHY (Cuddalore): Are you allowing him to place the evidence before the House?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I am not allowing it. We are not entering into it now.

I am only concerned now with the point whether this can be postponed for tomorrow. That is the only point which I am concerned with now. (Interruptions) Shri Amiyanath Bose may kindly sit down now.

SHRI AMIYANATH BOSE: If you order me to sit down, I shall sit down, but I shall stand up again.

SHRI HEM BARUA: It must be taken up today and not postponed for tomorrow. The calling-attention-notice must be taken up today.

MR. SPEAKER: May I tell Shri Amiyanath Bose that when we are discussing that subject, it is certainly his right to produce that evidence, but we are not discussing that subject now?

SHRI AMIYANATH BOSE: Kindly give me two minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Not now.

SHRI A. K. SEN : May I say something?

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON (Ernakulam): He is bent upon doing it for getting some cheap popularity. If he has got any evidence let him give it to the Speaker. We are prepared for that. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. After all, we cannot carry on in this way. Hon. Members must understand the difficulty of the Chair also. It is not as though the Chair is free to do anything it likes. That is the problem of the Chair. Let there be some understanding between the leaders of all parties and also the Leader of the House so that the Chair could take some decision on that basis. (*Interruptions*) I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not want that there should be any trial of any party on the floor of the House. It is not as if evidence is to be produced here so that any party could be tried. The trial of any party cannot be done here without the consent of.

AN HON. MEMBER : No party can be tried here on the floor of the House.

MR. SPEAKER : That is exactly what I am saying. No party can be tried on the floor of the House; neither the Congress Party nor any other party can be tried here on the floor of the House; that shall not be done here.

My difficulty is this. This is a serious matter. After all, I wanted to discuss with the Leaders of the House and then find out whether we can evolve a formula. May I make a suggestion? I am not postponing the issue. If I postpone it, tomorrow any Member may get up and do the same thing, and have the matter postponed. What I am saying is, if the House wants.

SHRI A. K. SEN : We want it.

MR. SPEAKER : I would suggest that we sit down and talk about it. It is not as if the Marxists are condemned. Nothing of the kind. The Minister him-

self might say that he has no such evidence. It may have appeared in the newspapers. That does not mean that it is correct. The Minister was going to make a statement. He might say that there is no such evidence till now. Here is a question that has been raised, I wanted to find out what I should do in the circumstances. That was my point.

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot) : I do not wish to speak on the call-attention notice or comment on this matter. I am concerned with the proposal which you put before the House that perhaps this matter may be postponed for further consideration.

I think the hon. Member, Shri Nath Pai, has made a valid point on this matter. If an objection is to be raised when a matter has been properly admitted by the Speaker after due consideration, if because a group of members or individuals object to the thing being discussed and we are going to sustain it, we are going to have a situation where one can even prevent a question being put to a Minister and he cannot give the facts. I think a very undesirable precedent will have been created. What does the call-attention notice say? It does not cast any aspersion on any one. It says :

“to call the attention of the Home Minister of Home Affairs to the reported”

It is perfectly open to the Minister of Home Affairs to corroborate the reports, to contradict them or give any statement of facts that he has so that the House and the country will have the benefit of knowing what the Minister has to say. It seems to me that stopping the House from proceeding with this is yielding to undue pressure.

On this very day, in the other House, there is a motion by Shri Bbupesh Gupta falsely charging patriotic elements in this country with complicity with the CIA, a motion moved from the same quarters which are now whinnying for protection. Are we also to be stopped from discussing that?

Therefore, I suggest that we proceed with the business of the House and let the Minister of Home Affairs reply.

SHRI A. K. SEN : As a point of order, I do not want to go into the merits of the question.

MR. SPEAKER : We are not going into the merits.

SHRI A. K. SEN : I know your decision in the matter is perfectly valid at this stage.

SHRI HEM BARUA : We know your predicament.

SHRI A. K. SEN : All I want to say is that once a question is put to the House, it is the privilege of the House either to allow even the hon. Member who has put it to withdraw it or proceed. It is the property of the House. Without the leave of the House, it is not open to you either to postpone it or to deprive the hon. Members of their right to get an answer or of the House to get an answer.

What is it that is contained here? I was very much surprised to hear Shri Dange saying that there should be an inquiry. Only the Government is giving its version on certain reports. It may be accepted by the House, it may be rejected by it. But I am surprised to hear Shri Dange giving the seal of finality to the Minister's statement, giving it the sanctity of a court judgment.

MR. SPEAKER : He has not made it.

SHRI A. K. SEN : Therefore, whatever the statement be, it is for the House either to reject it or to accept it. It is not a judgment. He has said that there should be an inquiry and so on. We shall never proceed with our business if that procedure is followed.

Everyday hon. Members on that side are casting aspersions while putting questions and so on. We hear views

on the matter. We accept it or reject it. But this is an attempt to stifle the Minister from informing the House on certain reports which have appeared in the papers and made public in statements by no less a person than the ex-Chief Minister of Bengal. He is the leader of a Party.

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : अभी तक हम सदन में एक दूसरे की आलोचना करते रहे हैं, एक दूसरे पर विवाद में गम्भीर आरोप भी लगाते रहे हैं। जिन के विरुद्ध आरोप लगाये गये उनको उनका खंडन करने का मौका भी मिला था। यह पहला मौका है कि किसी दल के विरुद्ध इस तरह की ध्यान-दिलाऊ सूचना पर यह संकल्प स्वीकार किया गया है। अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन यह है कि अभी कुछ दिन पहले मैंने एक प्रश्न दिया था।

हमने जम्मू-काश्मीर के एक एम० एल० ए० के बारे में प्रश्न दिया था, जो कांग्रेस पार्टी के हैं, जो पाकिस्तानी आक्रमण के समय घुस-पैठियों के साथ चले गए और फिर लौट कर चले आए। उस प्रश्न को आप के सचिवालय ने स्वीकार नहीं किया। अगर कांग्रेस के सदस्य कुछ राष्ट्र-विरोधी गतिविधियों में संलग्न होंगे, तो क्या आप इसी तरह का ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव स्वीकार करेंगे? हमें उस के बारे में सन्देह है। आप के नियम उन के खिलाफ भी काम में आने चाहिए। हम चाहेंगे कि सब दलों के आचरण पर चर्चा होनी चाहिए। जहां तक हमारा सबाल है, हमारे पास छिपाने के लिए कुछ नहीं है। हम ने जहां जो कुछ किया है, हम उस के बारे में अपनी सफाई देने के लिए तैयार हैं। लेकिन आप का सचिवालय सरकार को मदद देने के लिए विरोधी दलों के खिलाफ इस हथियार का उपयोग करे,....

MR. SPEAKER : What about this? You tell me whether we should postpone it or not.

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : अगर आप यह आश्वासन दें कि सब दलों के सम्बन्ध में, जिन में कांग्रेस पार्टी भी शामिल है, इस तरह

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

के ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव आदि स्वीकार किये जायेंगे, तो हमें इस में कोई आपत्ति नहीं है।

SHRI SHASHI RANJAN rose—

MR. SPEAKER : I wanted the Prime Minister or some other Minister to give Government's views. If you can represent them, I do not mind.

SHRI SHASHI RANJAN : I got up first of all.

MR. SPEAKER : I wanted the Government's view. All right, you come alone, I do not mind.

SHRI SHASHI RANJAN : In your wisdom, you have postponed its further consideration, but this is on the agenda today.

MR. SPEAKER : Do not repeat what others have said.

SHRI SHASHI RANJAN : I completely agree with what Mr. Masani has said as also Mr. Sen. I only wish to add that the question of the Jana Sangh leader whether you will give him an assurance does not arise out of this item of the agenda here. Secondly, nobody can encroach upon your right to reject or accept any such thing which is within your competence to accept or reject. To demand such an assurance is irrelevant, and it should not be given any consideration.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं केवल व्यवस्था सम्बन्धी बात के बारे में बोलना चाहता हूँ। हमारे यहां विभिन्न सूचनाओं को, वे सवालों के बारे में हों या प्रस्तावों के बारे में, स्वीकार करने के बारे में कुछ नियम हैं। मेरी व्यक्तिगत राय हमेशा यह रही है कि इन नियमों के बारे में उदारता का व्यवहार हो और इस सदन को सभी बातों पर बहस करने का मौका मिले, चाहे वह नक्सलबाड़ी हो और चाहे सी० आई० ए० हो। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में जो नियम है, उनको आप देखें।

लीजिए। प्रस्तावों के बारे में नियम 186 है, जिस में कहा गया है :

"It shall not contain arguments, inferences, ironical expressions, imputations or defamatory statements."

जिस ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव की बात हम कर रहे हैं, उस में कहा गया है :

" . . . involvement of C.P.I. (Marxist) in anti-national activities . . . "

SHRI M. R. MASANI : "A fact."

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रस्तावों के बारे में जो नियम है, उस को मैंने बता दिया है।

श्री अ० कु० सैन : रूल 197 देखिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : यह सभी नोटिसज के बारे में है। सवालों के बारे में भी इसी तरह की प्रक्रिया है। मैं आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ नियम 25 की तरफ। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या आप को यह अधिकार है कि आज हमारे सामने जो प्रस्ताव है, उस पर सभी लोगों से बातचीत कर के फैसला करने के लिए आप उस को टाल दें।

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : Is he sitting in appeal over you ?

श्री मधु लिमये : नियम 25 एरेन्जमेंट आफ गवर्नमेंट विजिनेस के बारे में है। उस में कहा गया है :

"Arrangement of Government business : On days allotted for the transaction of Government business, such business shall have precedence and the Secretary shall arrange that business in such order as the Speaker may, after consultation with the Leader of the House, determine :

Provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation."

इसका अर्थ यह है कि जो कार्य-सूची होती है, साधारणतः उस में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं होता है, लेकिन अगर आप की यह राय है कि उस में तब्दीली करने के लिए कोई ठोस कारण है, तो आप को ऐसा करने का अधिकार है। मेरी यह राय नहीं है कि इस प्रस्ताव को चर्चा के लिए न लिया जाये। लेकिन मैं इस लिए यह चाहता हूँ कि इस को कल लिया जाये कि हम लोग आप के साथ बैठ कर यह फैसला करें कि अगर इस तरह के ध्यानकर्षण प्रस्ताव पर यहां बहस करनी है, तो जब अन्य दलों के बारे में इस तरह के नोटिस आये, तब आप को समानता के साथ व्यवहार करना चाहिये। हो सकता है कि इस प्रस्ताव में जो बात कही गई है, उस के बारे में श्री मसानी की यह राय हो कि यह सत्य है, यह आरोप नहीं है। हो सकता है कि मेरी यह राय हो कि यह आरोप है, यह सत्य नहीं है। इस बारे में श्री मसानी, मेरी या अन्य माननीय सदस्यों की जो भी राय हो, लेकिन जब तक किसी अदालत में यह साबित नहीं हो जाता है, हम इस बारे में निश्चित रूप से कुछ नहीं कह सकते हैं। इसलिए इस बारे में हम एक प्रक्रिया निश्चित करें और फिर इस पर जरूर बहस करें। मैं हर बात पर बहस चाहता हूँ।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I have also read this Calling Attention matter, and I am one with many hon. Members. But I only wish to say that Calling Attention Notices are based on some press news or personal knowledge, and it should be of immediate importance. I have no grouse against those who table Calling Attention Notices in their own wisdom. But I say that even today, when we have tabled Calling Attention Notices on the reported letter of Shri Ajoy Mukherjee to the Prime Minister, bringing to her notice the police excesses committed in West Bengal and a deliberate attempt to crush the United Front workers there—these have appeared in the newspapers with banner headlines—you, in your wisdom summarily rejected them. What I wish to say is that in such matters—

this is pure and simple a Central matter, and Shri Ajoy Mukherjee, who was Chief Minister, has written a letter—it has come out in the newspapers under banner headlines—to the Prime Minister, bringing to her notice the police atrocities which are going on in the city of Calcutta and other places—the notice about it has been rejected. My submission is only this. (*Interruption*) Let us evolve a method by which these things should be raised. We have tabled a Calling Attention Notice about the CIA. We wanted a discussion. What happened to that? (*Interruption*).

SHRI S. A. DANGE : Reference has been made to my statement here by Mr. A. K. Sen, but I want to make my position clear here with a few words. If the Member were to ask a question about a particular party by referring to a specific act or a specific statement, then it could legitimately be put—without reference to rule—by a short notice question and require an answer. But when a statement about the character of a party as a whole is made in general terms, like involvement in anti-national affairs, then it becomes a reference to the general character of party and a demand to put it on trial. If that is so, it should not be done through such a short-handed method of Call Attention Notice. A proper procedure should be evolved where a Party with so many MPs are concerned, where a particular party is put on trial. I have no objection, if my party can be tried or any other party can be tried. (*Interruption*).

SHRI NATH PAI : There is a little confusion. Even at this stage, one could say much about the merits or demerits of the question, but I am refraining from saying anything on that. The Calling Attention Notice can be taken up today or you can postpone it. That is a simple question. The other question raised by Mr. Dange and Mr. Ramamurti is a larger question, about which I am in sympathy—about the convention. You can summon a meeting at your convenience to decide upon a convention regarding such matters. It is not a matter where we are giving

[Shri Nath Pai]

an opinion upon, today. We are prepared for a discussion.

But let us see the rule; Shri Madhu Limaye also referred to the rule on the subject. I would like to draw your attention to rule 197.

There would not be so much trouble if the rules were so well known; Rule 197 says :

"The proposed matter shall be raised after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon and at no other time during the sitting of the House."

That is a mandate for all of us.

Rule 25 says :

"Provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation."

Therefore, Sir, the discretion vested in you is not about postponing it, but about varying it on that day. It means, instead of taking up item 1 first, you can take up item 2, if you are satisfied that there is sufficient ground. But so far as postponement is concerned, only when it is the wish of the House you can postpone it till tomorrow or any other day, not otherwise.

SHRI HEM BARUA : You in your wisdom allowed on the floor of the House a discussion on Naxalbari, on the agreement between PIB and Novosti and so on. There was no objection then. I do not know why there is any objection to this call attention notice which you, in your wisdom, have admitted. I oppose the postponement of this call attention notice. This must be taken up here and now.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH) : The proviso to rule 25 is quite clear. According to

this proviso, you are competent to take any decision in this regard about variation in the agenda of the day.

The proviso says that if the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation, then it can be varied. So, you are the only person competent to take a decision on this.

SHRI SRINIBAS MISRA (Cuttack) : May I draw your attention to one thing ?

MR. SPEAKER : I have heard all party leaders and the rules also have been read. We have spent 45 minutes on this discussion. I only said, if the House wanted a postponement, it can be postponed. I did not want to do it myself. I only wanted a convention to be established; all the party leaders can meet in one place and take a decision. If I do not admit it, then I am accused that I am trying to shield somebody. If I admit it then also I am accused. There are some other questions about somebody being connected with CIA, etc. which are pending before me. These are embarrassing me terribly. If I admit, there is some difficulty. If I do not admit, there is some other difficulty. I am trying to balance.

It is becoming very difficult to balance between various parties. If I admit something, one party or other is naturally wounded. So far as this matter is concerned, having admitted it, if the House does not agree to postpone, it will be taken up. Tomorrow some other section of the House may want something else to be postponed and there will be absolutely no end to it. Naturally, the House has to take a decision. If the House is not inclined to postpone it, I would request Mr. Hem Barua to read the notice and the minister to reply to it. We need not presume that the minister is going to condemn anybody.

SHRI JYOTIMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour) : In future, you shall consult the House about the admission of any Calling Attention notice ?

MR. SPEAKER : No, please.