

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे एक सन्मोक्षण करना है। योजना हमारा टेलीफोन टेप होता है, हम काम नहीं कर पाते हैं। दिक्कत यह होती है कि हम बात कर रहे हैं तो कनेक्शन कट जाता है, आप उससे बहें कि इस को ठीक करायें। अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहुत जरूरी है, हर एक को यह शिकायत है, टेलीफोन टेप नहीं होना चाहिये।

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम लोगों को भी कुछ शिकायत है, रात को सो नहीं सकते हैं, आप जरा बैठ जायें तो बहें.....

MR. SPEAKER: Nobody can come with any subject any time. There is no item on the agenda.

12.45 hrs.

RE: HAPPENINGS IN U. P. VIDHAN SABHA

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE—rose (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday, he raised a question of what happened in U.P. Assembly. (Interruption)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): The U.P. Vidhan Sabha affair should be discussed here. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER: We had a discussion and after that discussion I have decided. I am not going to take up this question of U.P. Vidhan Sabha in this House. Now we pass on to the Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill. (Interruption)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Kindly allow us to say something on this subject. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry. I will have it referred to the Presiding Officers Conference; but it cannot be taken up just now.

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : अध्यक्ष महोदय टेलीफोन की बात चल रही थी, यू० पी० असेम्बली बीच में कहां से आ गई....

श्री अर्जुन सिंह भदौरिया (इटावा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विधान सभा के सदस्यों के साथ जो घटना हुई है, आप हमें उसके बारे में बहने दीजिये। आप हमको यहां पर बोलने का मौका क्यों नहीं देना चाहते हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के सदस्यों की घड़ियां छीन ली गई हैं.....

SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai): It is a break down of the Constitution so far as the Vidhan Sabha is concerned. That is what we are discussing. It is not the Speaker's conduct which is in question. We want to make certain observations about the constitutional aspect of it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE—rose.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): Why was discussion on West Bengal Assembly allowed in this House? (Interruption).

MR. SPEAKER: Should I again give the background? Yesterday, it was decided . . . (Interruption)

श्री शिव नारायण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, . .

MR. SPEAKER: You are a very disturbing factor; I am not going to tolerate it. These are the persons who submitted their Motions and I am talking to them. Did you also do anything? Why are you disturbing?

SHRI SHEO NARAIN: Are you suggesting Sir that we are doing nothing? I protest against it; I would like to leave the House.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : (दिल्ली सदर) अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप यह बताइये, जब हमने यहां पर बंगाल डिस्कस किया था तो यू० पी० क्यों डिस्कस नहीं हो सकता है ?

MR. SPEAKER: I expressed my view yesterday that whatever happened was within the four walls of

that legislature in due exercise of the rules of conduct and business. I expressed that I was very much distressed at that. But, anyhow, we have to respect certain conventions and constitutional provisions and also provisions of the relevant Assembly rules . . .

SHRI UMANATH: The conventions of this House also.

MR. SPEAKER: Not of this House. We are not competent . . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Are we Members of the Legislative Assembly or of this House?

MR. SPEAKER: By any stretch of imagination I cannot agree to what he is saying.

When hon. Members insisted, I called a meeting of the leaders; it was discussed and the consensus was that it should not be taken up in this House . . .

SHRI UMANATH: No, that is not fair. That raised fundamental questions with regard to our meeting.

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur): May I make a submission? You have referred to your meeting with all the leaders. I am not aware of whom exactly you had invited, but I know that Shri Samar Guha had attended it on behalf of the PSP. The report that he has given to me is to the effect that what they agreed to was not that they would not raise the matter, but that they would make an effort to persuade you to give us permission to raise it in the House, and that we would not pass any censure on the conduct of the Speaker there but that the events that had taken place in the House in UP would be discussed here. That was what was agreed to, not that we would not discuss. This was what I was told by him.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very sorry if anything like this was said or not. We discussed it in detail. I would tell hon. Members again and again that if something bad was done some time

back, that should not continue. For God's sake, let not hon. Members make this Parliament all-powerful, so powerful that we could discuss the affairs in a Legislative Assembly or we could discuss the conduct of the Speaker of any State Assembly . . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Kindly hear us for a minute.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not prepared to allow that. Nobody would approve, and I do not approve personally of what happened.

SHRI UMANATH: I shall only bring to your notice certain instances. Kindly hear me . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I do not arrogate to myself or to this House all the powers to discuss anything in a Legislative Assembly. We do not like certain happenings that have gone on. The times are so abnormal and everything is so much out of tune . . .

SHRI UMANATH: We have to follow our conventions, particularly the convention which we had adopted here when similar situations arose . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If something wrong had been done, that should not go on for all time. So, the hon. Member should not make a point of it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Our MLA from Kanpur and other Members were expelled. They were mercilessly beaten, and their watches were snatched away and stolen by the police. And yet you are saying that we cannot raise this issue here . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: At least I am not one of those people who would allow a situation where they would pass a privilege motion against us and we shall pass a privilege motion against them . . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: These things have happened because Shri C. B. Gupta's government is there. We want to kick him out. If you do not allow us here, we shall go there and kick him out.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN: We shall kick out our hon. friend from Kanpur . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If the Members are dissatisfied, then there are other alternatives open to them. If they are dissatisfied with the Ministry there, they could bring forward a no-confidence motion against that Ministry in that House. If they are dissatisfied with the conduct of the Speaker here, they could table a motion against him in that House, because that is the appropriate House for this purpose.

SHRI UMANATH: I was present at yesterday's meeting. Yesterday, you said that you felt that the conduct of the UP Speaker and other such things should not be discussed here. When we pointed out that it had been allowed on earlier occasions you had said that if a mistake had been done in the past that should not continue. Then I said definitely that this was not the time for deciding on new conventions, and that the discussion on the question of the UP Vidhan Sabha should be allowed, since the discussion on West Bengal Assembly had already taken place here, and afterwards, we could meet and discuss about any new convention. Also, the discussion on the affairs in the Punjab Assembly had taken place here. But we find that you are saying now something different. I am pointing this out because tomorrow you will have to call a meeting of the leaders of the groups; we do not have minutes of these meetings; we come to a certain understanding, because we respect you and you respect us, and we have to continue on that basis.

Yesterday, what happened was that you took this position, but many of us did not accept that position. Ultimately when we took the decision, we said that we would raise the question and we would express our views, and ultimately you would say what you wanted on the whole thing. That was the understanding. But now you have said that you would not allow it at all. But the understanding was that you were not in favour of it but we would raise it and each one of us

would speak on behalf of each group and ultimately you would make your observations. That was the understanding. But if you say something contrary, that raises a very fundamental question with regard to the future meetings between us.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member may kindly listen to me . . .

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY (Kendrapara): May I make one humble request? You are entitled to, and you may, establish new conventions, and we have nothing to say against it. Here, the matter is entirely within the purview of Parliament and that is what we feel, because the requisitioning of the police into the precincts of the House in a State legislature is something which can never be supported by anybody who has any respect for parliamentary institutions. That is why we want to discuss that specific matter. This House has discussed this matter not once but twice and in fact several times in different matters. So, let us be very clear about it. We respect your wishes, and we do not want to make any reflection on the conduct of the Speaker of the UP Assembly. But we are deeply concerned at the events that had happened inside the House, and, therefore I think that it would be proper and appropriate that we should discuss this matter.

SHRI M. R. MASANI (Rajkot): Question.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: And kindly allow us sufficient time for this discussion before we adjourn.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जैसी कि हमको वहाँ खबर मिली है और जैसा आपने आज अखबार में भी देखा होगा कि उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के अध्यक्ष और मुख्य मंत्री ने दाखल किया कि कुछ सदस्यों के साथ ज्यादाती हुई पुलिस के द्वारा और उनके लिए उन्होंने माफी

भी मांगी। आप जानते हैं किसी भी सदन के सदस्य का यह संवैधानिक अधिकार है कि वह सदन में मौजूद रहे और अपनी बात कहे। इसलिए जब सदन के किसी सदस्य को अनियमित ढंग से बिना किसी कसूर के और बिना किसी कानूनी अधिकार के पुलिस वहाँ से निकालती है तो उसका मतलब यह है कि उन सदस्य के संवैधानिक अधिकार समाप्त हो गये। ऐसी स्थिति में जब संविधान टूटता हो तब फिर हमको पूरा हक हो जाता है कि उसपर यहाँ विचार करें।

श्री अर्जुन सिंह भदौरिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के अध्यक्ष के मिलसिले में कोई चर्चा करने का सवाल मैं यहाँ पर नहीं उठाना चाहता हूँ। लेकिन उत्तर प्रदेश विधान सभा के अन्दर पुलिस के द्वारा जा गुंडागर्दी हुई और जानबूझ कर सदस्यों के धार्मिक हकों का जो हनन हुआ उसका यहाँ पर उठाने का हमको संवैधानिक अधिकार है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ पर विधान सभा के सदस्यों का केवल उठाका फौदा ही नहीं गया बल्कि उनकी घड़ियाँ छीनी गई, कलम निकाले गए और तीन सदस्यों की टोपियाँ छीन कर घर्ती पर डाल दी गई। तो क्या जब उनके संवैधानिक अधिकारों का हनन किया जा रहा हो, हम अपने मुँह बन्द रखें? यह हमारे लिए उचित नहीं होगा। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप होम मिनिस्टर से कहें कि इस मिलसिले में वे अपना बयान प्रसारित करें जिससे कि वहाँ की सारी स्थिति पर विचार किया जा सके।

Shri S. KUNDU (Balasore): You said that you were distressed. Why did you say that? You said so because you felt that the Constitution had been flouted. Nobody is above the Constitution, neither you nor even the President nor the Speaker of that Assembly. It has been made clear that we are not going to discuss the conduct of the Speaker. Very important happenings have taken place, and

if you do not allow us to express our opinion on behalf of the masses of the people, then everything can happen. Tomorrow, the military may be called to this House. Then, what is the protection for the people? What is the protection for the citadel of democracy? Why do you want to refuse permission? We would appeal to you, we would beseech you to kindly admit this discussion. Let there be a discussion and let people know everything about it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: May I remind you that some time ago, before you had been elevated to this high office, you had told us in this House in your own words sitting over there what you felt and you had given us at that time an account of how you had yourself been present for a short while in the Punjab Vidhan Sabha just before those ugly incidents had taken place? You told us—I remember—how you came away seeing everything proceeding normally and after you reached Delhi you heard of what had happened there. Then a discussion was taking place in this House. You expressed your deep concern and anguish at what had happened in Punjab where the police broke into the Assembly premises.

13 hrs.

We had asked on the first day only that the Home Minister should make a statement in this House on the events that have taken place. In the case of West Bengal, the discussion went on here. We protested all the time, saying that the events that took place in the West Bengal Assembly were not the concern of this House. But it was decided that it would be discussed and a debate was allowed and it went on for two days or three days. What kind of double-standards are we applying now?

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam): I agree with you that we should not discuss what has happened in the UP State Assembly. On the day when it was decided that the incidents in the

[Shri Sezhiyan.]

West Bengal Assembly should be discussed here, I, speaking on behalf of my Party, said that we were not for a discussion of that matter, we could not discuss what happened inside a State Assembly. I asked what would happen if, for example, some other legislature were to discuss our conduct, what happens here. I would quote from the record of the proceedings: of the 6th August: While moving his Motion, Shri Hem Barua said:

"I must congratulate the Home Minister of West Bengal for the commendable courage shown by him in the face of the agitation. The same thing cannot be said about the hon. Speaker of West Bengal Assembly. The very fact that he had to run away through the window shows the depth and dimension of the vandalism committed by the police".

At that point, I entered a protest:

"We should not discuss the conduct of the Speaker of a State legislature here. It is beyond the scope of this discussion and this House".

In spite of that, the discussion went on for five long hours analysing the pros and cons of what happened inside the West Bengal Assembly. I still maintain that we should not discuss what happens inside a State Assembly, but a bad precedent has been created.

Now I will quote from the speech of an hon. member opposite, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, on the same subject on the same day:

"We are discussing this subject today because all of us look upon this incident not merely as a law and order problem but as a serious challenge to our Constitution, to the whole democratic functioning. We consider that the Central Government is responsible to see that democracy functions properly at the State level, and if it does not,

the responsibility for that lies squarely on them. That is why we are able to discuss this subject today; otherwise, I am sure, our friends on that side would have created such a row here that we could not have had our say here".

Therefore, a precedent has been set. I still maintain that we should not discuss what happened in the UP Assembly. We should confine ourselves to what is within our purview, because if somebody in a State Assembly takes it upon himself to move a motion to discuss our conduct here, we will be put in an embarrassing position. Centre-State relations will be affected. The hon. Home Minister also stuck to that position. In spite of all this, in spite of our protest, a five-hour discussion was allowed here on what happened in the West Bengal Assembly. Therefore, in what we do now, we should not let the impression go round to the outside world that Parliament is concerned only when some ugly incidents happen in a non-Congress State and will ignore it when it happens in a Congress State.

I do not want that you should express an opinion. Let us not cast any aspersions on the conduct of the Speaker. I say this because on the 6th August when we discussed the West Bengal Assembly incident, definite aspersions were cast on the Speaker in that he lacked courage and so on. While congratulating the Home Minister of the State, the Mover cast aspersions on the Speaker of the Assembly. This has gone on record. I quoted from it. You are in the Chair. While discharging the functions of that august office, you will see that no member is allowed to cast any aspersion on the conduct of the Speaker; if such observations are made, you could pull up the member or expunge those observations.

This is a serious matter affecting the functioning of democracy in this country. We should see to it that no two

standards are set. I do not want you to give any opinion or judgment. Let members express their views as to how democracy should function, to what extent we can remedy the situation that has arisen, to what extent we can help. At the same time, if any member casts any aspersion on the conduct of anyone there, you could pull up the member or expunge those remarks. We are in your hands.

श्री यज्ञ दत्त शर्मा (अमृतसर) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय आपका ध्यान इस बात पर खींचना है कि देश के विधान मंडलों के अन्दर जो घटनाएं घट रही हैं मैं समझता हूँ कि देश के इस महान सदन को निश्चित रूप से उन पर ध्यान देना चाहिये। और आप हमें इस सम्बन्ध में इस प्रकार का अवसर दे सकते हैं कि लोकतंत्र के प्रति उपस्थित होने वाली गम्भीर समस्या के बारे में हम विचार कर सकें और हमें विचार करना भी चाहिये। विश्व का यह सबसे बड़ा लोकतंत्र है और इसके अन्दर आज इस तरीके से यदि पुलिस सदनों में घुसे और लोकतंत्र की प्रतिष्ठा को हानि पहुंचे और उस पर हम विचार न करें तो संसार के अन्दर हमारे प्रति अनेक प्रकार की आन्तियां फेलेंगी और देश में लोक तंत्र के लिए एक बहुत बड़ा संकट आयेगा। जैसी यहां परम्परा पड़ चुकी है बंगाल या पंजाब विधान सभाओं के अन्दर हुई घटनाओं पर इस सदन ने विचार किया उसी तरह से आज जो उत्तर प्रदेश के अन्दर घटना घटी है हम चाहेंगे कि आप हमें इस बात का अवसर देंगे, इस सदन को इन बात का अवसर देंगे कि सारी स्थिति के ऊपर विचार कर सकें और संसार को बता सकें कि यह महान सदन लोकतंत्र की रक्षा के लिए एक महान प्रहरी के रूप में खड़ा है।

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam): This is a happening over which people all over India will come to have their own opinions not to speak of the outside world also. We are all concerned

about the proper way in which democracy has got to function through the legislatures. Within the legislatures, the Speaker is the presiding authority and outsiders are not to express any views about his behaviour or even about the members' behaviour. Then the question of privilege comes up. We do not know what actually happened, but we do know that what the Speaker was supposed to have done displeased quite a larger number of members in the UP Vidhar Sabha. It was their privilege either to accept his ruling or to disobey his ruling and defy him. They have defied him. It was also the right of the Speaker to ask those members to behave and when they did not behave, to assert his authority through the Marshal and when the Marshal was overpowered, to call in the police, on the advice of the Marshal, I suppose. We can hold our own views, but we cannot freely discuss those things in this House. Suppose we happen to be in that position. It may be proper or improper to accept or not to accept your decision. We may defy it also. It is within our rights to do so. It is for the people to decide whether what we have done is right or what the Speaker has done is right. It is our right to defy the Speaker and face the consequences. Why on earth should we squeal about it? It is for the electorate to say whether our behaviour was correct or not.

We expect Members of Parliament or of State legislatures to behave in a responsible and decent manner, in a manner which would set an example to the ordinary people all over the country. (Interruptions). We should be prepared to face the consequences of our behaviour. I was also a civil resister. (Interruptions). I do not want to condemn anybody. When the proper time comes, it is for the electorate of UP to express their view whether what the Speaker has done is right or what the members have done is right. Let us leave it to them. I plead with you not to allow a discussion on this matter.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East): Mr. Speaker, I am distressed that a very embarrassing situation has arisen, particularly because some of us were with you in your chamber yesterday. So, I was expecting that many of the unpleasant happenings this morning could have been avoided if you yourself had made a statement, explaining the reasons why there was a kind of consensus that we should not have a discussion in this House. I was expecting certain observations to fall from you because I feel that we should not be driven into emulating certain people in Uttar Pradesh or elsewhere in this House. If you wish to start a new convention which, in so far as it refuses to impinge upon the autonomous rights of State Legislatures, is a very commendable thing, if you want to do it, it is necessary to preface it with some statement which would clarify the position and this impression of double standards being used in regard to West Bengal and Uttar Pradesh could have been removed. As far as I am concerned, I was yesterday with you in your chamber and I was hesitating to get up and intervene, which I am doing this morning; but I got a definite impression that there were certain additional reasons which make it rather inconvenient and improper for us to have the kind of discussion, which is very likely to take place in this House, on this sort of sensitive matter. One reason for that, as far as I could gather, was that there was hardly any information which we could get from UP on the basis of which we could have a discussion. In the case of West Bengal what happened was that there was a State Government of West Bengal which had volunteered itself to send up all information to the Central Government. But here, in the case of UP, it appears—we were given that impression—that the State Government of Uttar Pradesh is unable to collect any information in regard to this matter, because the Secretariat of the Speaker in the UP Legislature has taken the stand that this is something

on which they are not going to give any report to anybody else. Just as in the case of the struggle of the judiciary and the Legislature in UP, where a kind of a position arose when no side can take a decisive line, here in this case also, if the State Legislature of UP refuses to give any kind of fact, if it is on the basis of newspaper reports we are going to have a discussion, that very probably is likely to degenerate into something which would not be in the best interests of whatever we cherish. That is why I say that if you, after cogitation, tomorrow give us a full statement as to the reasons why you think that this matter could not be discussed in this House, then the position would be cleared. But there should not be a suggestion, remotely even, of double standards, because the case of West Bengal has come in, perhaps, very unfortunately has come in; some of us had objected it has come—I do not wish to consolidate a bad precedent, if it was a bad precedent—some of us had objected at that time; if our objections are genuine, at this point of time, we would not like to resuscitate this matter by saying similar matters should be discussed in this House; I would not like that. But this should be stated clearly and cogently. That is why I am telling you that you should please come tomorrow and give us a statement, giving the essence of the consensus which took place yesterday, and then we shall have an understanding of the whole thing. That is my submission. I do not want to be deviling the water any more than it be.

SHRI RANGA: I endorse what he says.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं केवल यह प्रार्थना करूंगा कि अगर सरकार अपना वक्तव्य देने के लिए तैयार है तो जैसा पंजाब के बारे में किया गया था या बंगाल के बारे में यहां पर किया गया था आप हमारे ध्यानाकर्षण प्रस्ताव को मान लीजिये और उस पर मंत्री महोदय को जवाब देना ही पड़ेगा। पंजाब के बारे

में हमने स्वयं दिया था और उसे मान लिया गया था वैसे ही इस पर मान लीजिये ।

SHRI UMANATH: On the conduct of the Union Government I would like to say this. On the question of the statement here we were informed by the Government that they could not make a statement because the authorities of the State refused to give them information; so, they could not make a statement. That is what we are informed by the Government. Under similar circumstances, Government in the past have come out with a statement based on the information supplied by their own agencies, independent agencies. It was refused on the ground that it affected a matter of privilege. It is only the proceedings that are asked for. The proceedings of an Assembly is not a privileged document.

Secondly, we are unable to bear the beating up of MLAs. Whatever be the rules and whatever be the powers of anybody, it is mentioned there that about 200 policemen were brought there and they were made to beat up all the Opposition.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal): With great regret I have to submit to you that the way in which hon. Members.... (*Interruption*.)

SHRI UMANATH: The explanation given is that voting was fixed for 2.30

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: He has started a regular debate. You must also hear our view then.

MR. SPEAKER: Please wind up in one minute.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: It has become a regular discussion.

SHRI UMANATH: For the resort to police and beating up of the MLAs the explanation given is that voting was to take place at 2.30. I am not going into the merits of it but we know

that whatever be the understanding the ruling party has got to be ready for a snap vote at any time. In Kerala with a majority of two, for 28 months we ruled without the danger of a snap vote. For the failure of the Congress Party in Uttar Pradesh should the MLAs suffer police beating inside the House? Just for the failure of the Congress Party in the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha, should the Assembly Members be deprived.... (*Interruption*)? we will not tolerate it. For the failure of the Congress Party should the MLAs be prisoners.... (*Interruption*)? That is why we say that there must be a discussion and you must permit it.

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday we discussed this matter in detail.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Sir, are you allowing a discussion to be carried on here?

MR. SPEAKER: No.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: Or, are you listening to the views of Members? Then, in all right, we must also be entitled to express our views.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a discussion. This is something pertaining to the meeting yesterday.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul): You should be kind enough to give me one minute.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I want to make a suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday we discussed it and I put forth my view that if we start discussing what is happening inside every State Legislature, what the Speaker did, right or wrong, what the Members did, why did he enforce this rule, why did he not enforce this rule, why he use the Marshal etc., there will be no end.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBALAH: Your ruling will also be debated in other Assemblies then.

MR. SPEAKER: There are guarantees given by the rules and by the Constitution. In the case of Punjab, the House had already adjourned and the police came after the adjournment of the House. Everybody knows it. In the case of West Bengal, the Speaker adjourned the House and there was no date fixed. There was nothing on the merits of that case. That was about the adjournment of that House. Anyway, I did not question it.

I am not very happy at the precedents. I said, I was not very happy. If something wrong was set, that should not continue for all the time. This is what I told them. I may be very much distressed. I told them yesterday, "Let me discuss this matter in the Conference of Presiding Officers; that is the proper forum and I would lay this case fully from your point of view."

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: That is in December.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDY: It will be helpful if you know the views of Members. If you allow a discussion here, it will strengthen your hands when you discuss this matter in the Presiding Officers' Conference. You can convey our feelings there.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not want something to be coming out of me in my experience, that I should also give a ruling on everything that is going on.

After that they said that they wanted to discuss it. I said, "No, not in that shape in which you want to discuss it, namely, what the Speaker did, what the Members did and what are their privileges. You put in a general motion in any form about anything outside the Legislature and I have no objection if it is admissible on merits." They did not come out with that. I conveyed it to the Secretary, Lok Sabha, "Please convey it to Shri Banerjee that in this shape I do not accept it."

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Read my motion. I have given a motion under 193..... (Interruption).

MR. SPEAKER: If there is anything concerning the general administration and if it is admissible on its merits, I have no objection to it. You can come with any other thing. I am not very happy with what happened inside the Legislature. I unequivocally say that I am not happy with what happened inside but we have no power to discuss this.

I can give you that privilege to come with a Calling Attention notice on why the police entered the Legislature and let the Minister make a statement. But if you ask me to allow you to discuss this, tomorrow it may be the Madras Legislature and the day after some other Legislature. Then, they will also start discussing our conduct in Parliament in their own Legislatures. There will be no end to it. I am very sorry I cannot allow it.

The House now stands adjourned for lunch.

13.21 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Twenty Minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at twenty three minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[SHRI K. N. TIWARY in the Chair]

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE. DISAPPROVAL OF BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE AND BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY (AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

श्री राम धन (लाल गंज) : सभापति महोदय कल मैं कह रहा था कि स्वतंत्र पार्टी के श्री अमीन ने यह कहा था कि जो उपक्रम हुए हैं या विश्वविद्यालय में जो गड़बड़ियां हुई हैं उनके लिए डा० जोशी उत्तरदायी