

[Shri S. C. Jamir]

- (2) A copy of the Annual Report on the working of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952 for the year 1966-67. [Placed in Library. See No. LT—243/68]
- (3) A copy of the Main Conclusions of the Twenty-seventh Session of the Standing Labour Committee held at New Delhi on the 30th September, 1967. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-244/68].

12.32 hrs.

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH REPORTS**

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot): I beg to present the following Reports of the Public Accounts Committee :—

- (1) Fifteenth Report on Appropriation Accounts (Defence Services), 1965-66 and Audit Report (Defence Services), 1967.
- (2) Sixteenth Report on Appropriation Accounts (Defence Services), 1965-66, and Audit Report (Defence Services), 1967—Defence Production.

12.32½ hrs.

STATEMENT ON COMMONWEALTH IMMIGRANTS BILL OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Bhagat.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंघेर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे इस पर ऐतराज है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: हमने इसके बारे में ध्यान आकर्षण सूचनाएँ दी थीं लेकिन आपने उन्हें स्वीकार नहीं किया। अब हम प्रश्न नहीं पूछ सकते। हमें शिकायत है कि भारत सरकार को इस मामले में जो कुछ करना चाहिये वह नहीं कर रही है। या तो आप इस पर पृथक चर्चा का मौका दें।

MR. SPEAKER: Let him study the statement. I will also go through it more carefully.

श्री मधु लिमये: व्यवस्था के बारे में आप मेरी बात मुन लीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप का ध्यान नियम 372 की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ :

"A statement may be made by a Minister on a matter of public importance with the consent of the Speaker, but no question shall be asked at the time the statement is made".

तीसरी लोक सभा में इस नियम के बावजूद यहाँ पर यह परम्परा थी कि स्पष्टीकरण के तौर पर प्रश्न पूछे जाते थे। लेकिन उम के बाद समय बचाने के लिये आपने यहाँ पर यह प्रणाली कायम की कि जब मंत्रियों के वक्तव्य होंगे तो उस पर सवाल नहीं पूछे जायेंगे, लेकिन अगर मामला गंभीर हो तो आप या तो आधे घंटे की या एक घंटे की बहस की, जो नई प्रक्रिया है नियम 193 के तहत, उसके मुनाबिक उसकी इजाजत देंगे और देते रहे हैं। साथ साथ जो हमारी ध्यान दिलाने की प्रक्रिया है, मुझे ऐसा लग रहा है कि उम को बिल्कुल खत्म किया जा रहा है। आज भी कोई ध्यान आकर्षण प्रस्ताव नहीं लाया गया, कन भी नहीं लाया गया था। कई कई दिन ऐसे ही जा रहे हैं। पहले यहाँ ऐसा इंतजाम था कि कभी कभी ध्यान आकर्षण प्रस्ताव में दस-दस और पन्द्रह पन्द्रह नाम होते थे और मंत्र को प्रश्न पूछने का मौका दिया जाता था। आपने कहा कि इस तरह से काम नहीं चल पायेगा। इस लिये हमने अपने अधिकारों पर रोक लगाई कि एक ध्यान आकर्षण प्रस्ताव में पांच से अधिक नाम नहीं होंगे। अगर एकसे अधिक हस्ताक्षर होंगे तो एक की ही नोटिस मानी जायेगी। चाहे जितना महत्वपूर्ण सवाल हो, एक व्यक्ति एक से अधिक ध्यान दिलाने का मामला नहीं उठायेगा। आप देखिये कि हम ने अपने अधिकारों पर कितनी रोक लगाई है। नियम 372

के तहत जो वक्तव्य आते हैं, उन पर भी हम प्रश्न नहीं पूछेंगे, यह भी हमने मान लिया। ऐसी स्थिति में क्या आप का कर्तव्य नहीं है कि जब सदस्यों द्वारा सार्वजनिक महत्व के प्रश्नों के ऊपर नोटिस दिये जाते हैं तब उनको कुछ सुविधा दी जाय? आपने इस व्यवस्था को मान लिया है कि सबसे पहले जिसकी नोटिस आयेगी उसको मान लिया जायेगा। अगर सदस्यों की पहले आई है तो सदस्यों की मानी जायेगी और अगर मंत्रियों ने पहले आप को सूचना दी है कि वह नियम 372 के तहत वक्तव्य देने वाले हैं, तो उनकी नोटिस मानी जायेगी।

इस मामले में हम लोगों ने सबसे पहले आप का ध्यान दिलाया और आपकी मार्फत सरकार का। लेकिन इसमें हमारे अधिकारों पर कुठाराघात हो रहा है। अगर यह ध्यान आकर्षण के रूप में आता तो कम से कम पांच सदस्यों को तो स्पष्टीकरण के तौर पर सवाल पूछने का मौका मिलता और उसमें से कई बातें निकलती और और बहस होती। इस लिये आप इस के बारे में व्यवस्था दीजिये ताकि आइन्दा हम लोगों को असन्तोष न हो।

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : I fully endorse the plea just now made by Mr. Limaye. There are two things. It was because of your guidance and in consultation with you that we agreed to curtail some of our rights, but we are very constrained to tell you that the new system which you evolved with so much hope and faith has completely failed.

This piece of legislation which has been introduced in the House of Commons, on which a Bishop of England has resigned, a former Attorney-General has found it disgraceful, and the *sedate London Times*...

MR. SPEAKER : You are going into the subject matter.

SHRI NATH PAI : My sentence even is not complete.

MR. SPEAKER : If it is a point of order, I can understand.

SHRI NATH PAI : My sentence was not heard. When Charles I went to the House of Commons, the Speaker of the House of Commons said—he was wrongly quoted, may I humbly quote it correctly for the benefit of all of us—"I have no tongue to speak". The House of Commons Speaker said he does not speak, but here the Speaker will interrupt a member.

MR. SPEAKER : You are not raising a point of order, but making a speech about what was said in the House of Commons.

SHRI NATH PAI : Not in the least. I was trying to emphasize the importance of calling attention which you have disallowed.

Now, see our predicament. You will not allow us to raise this matter which vitally concerns us. It was in that context that you have....

MR. SPEAKER : Will you kindly sit down? You have made your point clear.

SHRI NATH PAI : This was part (a). Now, part (b) of my point of order is this. Under rule 372 it is true that a Minister can make a statement, but I want you to apply your mind to this. You allow the Minister to make a statement on an important matter on which you disallow the calling attention notices. What is the remedy for us? We are prevented from asking questions, because it is a statement made by the Minister under rule 372. We are debarred, you do not allow us, I do not say deliberately, I am not accusing you of having any motive, but for reasons best known to you, you think it proper to disallow the calling attention, and having disallowed the calling attention on the same subject if the Minister is to make a statement, I plead with you that in consonance with the well-established precedent of this House, before we take up the issue as to what best to do with the calling attention, on the present issue on which the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs will be making a statement, you be pleased to allow some questions; if that is not your pleasure you give us an opportunity to

[Shri Nath Pai]

raise a debate, but let not the matter end with the statement of the Minister in this House. We are all agitated over what the House of Commons is doing under a Socialist Ministry.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन है कि यह अलग सवाल है कि इस तरह के मामलों में हम आगे कौन सी प्रक्रिया अपनायें क्या ध्यान आकर्षण सूचनायें अधिक स्वीकार की जायें या क्या जो वक्तव्य होने वाला है उस पर आप हम को अपनी भावनायें प्रकट करने का मौका दें। मैं यह मानने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि मंत्रियों द्वारा दिये जाने वाले हर वक्तव्य पर प्रश्न करने की छूट देना आप के लिये संभव नहीं होगा क्योंकि वह सदन का बहुत समय लेगा। लेकिन अगर ध्यान आकर्षण सूचना स्वीकार कर ली जाती है तो हम इस धर्म संकट से भी बच जाते। अब वह तो स्वीकार नहीं की गई है। या तो आप इस वक्तव्य पर हमें अभी प्रश्न पूछने का मौका दें या फिर आप यह तय कर लें कि इस पर हम को छोटी सी चर्चा करने का मौका मिल जायेगा, जिस से सदन के सभी वर्ग इस सवाल पर अपने विचार प्रकट कर सकें। यह पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, सारे भारत के दृष्टिकोण को इस में रखना है।

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East): You yourself indicated the seriousness of this matter. You have told us that you intend to study the substance of what he says, and then think over it. You have said so because this a subject which has already caused an international furore, and a kind of scandal appears to be sought to be perpetrated by the British House of Commons. So, this House is terribly, deeply concerned, because our own people are going to be put in jeopardy. Therefore, naturally we feel that the opportunity which we should rightly have of discussing this matter should be given to us, and therefore I confirm the appeal made to you by all these members.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): I fully associate myself with the sentiments expressed by my friends in this regard. This matter has been agitating everybody in this country and we must get the earliest opportunity to record our views. You in your discretion have got the prerogative and the inherent right to relax this rule....

MR. SPEAKER : I have been doing that already.

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA (Anand): This matter is very important; it affects our relations with the British Government. We cannot remain indifferent to this matter. We have some questions to ask of the hon. Minister. If not now, at least in the evening we may be allowed to ask some questions.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA (Gurdaspur): The calling attention notices are a safety valve for the House and you have plugged that safety valve. You are my honoured Speaker and my guru.

MR. SPEAKER : Not Guru.

SHRI D. C. SHARMA : You have plugged that safety valve very badly. There are some persons who always have bad luck. I am one of them. I never have good luck so far as lotteries are concerned. I send three or four call attention notices every day but when the Lobby Assistant comes to me I begin to tremble because I know that he is bringing bad news saying that all those had been disallowed..... (Interruptions.)

SHRI A. S. SAIGAL (Bilaspur): The point is this. It is our suggestion. You may accept the suggestion or not accept it.

हम ग्यारह बजे से बारह बजे तक क्वेश्चन आवर करें और बारह बजे से पांच बजे तक जो हाउस का बिजनेस है उसको करें। पांच बजे से सात बजे तक ये जितने मैटर्न्स हैं इनको डिस्कस करें। हम हाउस आफ कामन्स की प्रेक्टिस क्यों नहीं फालो करते हैं ?

MR. SPEAKER : The point is this. He has made a very useful suggestion and therefore I need not reply to that. For the last three days we did not have a call attention notice. What is the reason? We have been having a discussion every day on some important subject. Anybody can see the debates of the last three days. It may not be in the form of call attention notice. It is not as if we can discuss an important subject only in call-attention notices. Only five questions are allowed in call attention notices. But other kinds of discussions are not like that. I know that this is an important matter; people are leaving Kenya and they are facing difficulties. I could have allowed a call attention notice but then no sixth question will be permitted.

My difficulty is this. I allow two hours discussions and one hour discussions. But instead of sticking to the time-limit of two hours, Members take more time and naturally the House loses its patience. If still the House wants to continue the discussion it is a different matter but the House also gets tired at times; if may be this side or that side; the House as a whole gets tired. Therefore, now, when we allow a discussion we must confine ourselves to the time-limit: not correctly to the minute; it may be ten minutes this way or that way. But it cannot be increased by 100 per cent. For instance, now, today, I have allowed a one-hour discussion in the afternoon. I wonder how I can regulate it because all the parties must be allowed to speak. It is not only the question of the Deputy-Speaker being in the Chair. Even from now on, I am thinking how the debate could be concluded if all the parties must be given a chance within one hour. This, you must think about, not here—we should not waste our time here—but when we sit again; we must think how best it can be helped. I know you have been very obliging and you have followed the rules very well and co-operated completely, but this difficulty will arise. Within one hour, if I am to call all the parties, then it will be impossible. Therefore, we must evolve some method. Every day, we are having some discussion or the

other, and I am very liberal with the Member. (*Interruption*) Order, order. I am coming to the point. I am on my legs and I am sorry I cannot allow anybody else to rise now.

The point now is whether I should allow questioning now on the statement which he was going to make. He has not yet been permitted to make it because of points of order having come in between. I we allow the questions, that means no more discussion; the one hour or two hours which are likely to be spent on a discussion usefully will be wasted. If questions are allowed, then, if Mr. Nath Pai gets up and is permitted, then automatically I have to permit Mr. D. C. Sharma, for instance, and when another hon. Member that side gets up, I will have to allow Mr. Sheo Narain and others also on this side to put questions. How can I prevent it? I want to know. How can anybody in the Chair prevent anybody getting up and asking for a clarification? It will be a waste of time. Therefore, you may just read the statement and we shall see. Already I have fixed up one or two hours today for a discussion. And the budget is coming; it cannot be postponed. We shall certainly have a discussion, and in the meanwhile, I will call for a meeting. I want your help, so as to see how this one hour and two hours could be adjusted. I want a discussion, on anything which is important. Instead of only two or three questions being put by one or two Members only, I want a larger number of Members to take part, so that some useful discussion can take place. Therefore, let us think about it and fix up some time later on, not immediately now.

Now, the statement is so big and I do not think it need be read. It runs to about 6 to 7 pages. So I would request the Minister to lay it on the Table.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SURENDRA PAL SINGH): I beg to lay the statement on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library, See No. LT—270/68*].