

Releases for 1972-73 will be made by the Government of India to the State Government depending on the progress of the schemes.

**Proposals made by North Eastern Council or extension of Railways from Dharmanagar to Agartala**

2379. SHRI BIREN DUTTA : Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) whether North Eastern Council has discussed the problem of extension of Railway from Dharmanagar to Agartala for integrated development of that region ;

(b) whether any proposal has been made by the Council for improving road transport system in that region ; and

(c) if so, the main points of the proposals ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN) : (a) to (c). With the enforcement of the North Eastern Council Act, 1971 as from 1st August, 1972, the Council has come into existence only from that date. The Council has not met so far.

12.03 hrs.

#### RE : MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I rise on a point of order (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : What is the point of order ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I rise on a point of order under Rule 376 (2) . . .

MR. SPEAKER : The Speaker does not normally announce his decision in the House itself; he conveys it to the office that such and such a matter has not been admitted. Please do not arise in this manner in the House. Why do you go beyond the convention of the House ? (*Interruptions*) It cannot be allowed as an adjournment motion. I have already conveyed it to hon. Members that it cannot be allowed as an adjournment motion. If there is a dispute between the Corporation of Bombay and the labour, how can it come here ? At the same time, broad questions cannot be the subject-matter of an adjournment motion. They can table other motions for discussion, but they cannot discuss it through an adjournment motion. Adjournment

motion has its own rules about it. (*Interruptions*). As hon. Members know, broad questions of policy cannot be discussed through an adjournment motion. There have been a number of rulings in this House before also that lock-outs, strikes etc. cannot come through an adjournment motion . . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : On a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER : I am sorry it cannot be allowed as an adjournment motion.

SHRI K.D. MALAVIYA (Domariaganj) : I want to make a very serious effort to understand what this uneasiness from the Opposition side is about . . . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I rise on a point of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER : So far as the Speaker's ruling is concerned, there can be no point of order on the question of admitting the adjournment motion.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Kindly see the business before the House. I am raising the point of order under the rule 367 (2) which says :

"A point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment."

At the moment . . .

MR. SPEAKER : I have not allowed it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Kindly hear me, Sir. I am not questioning your ruling. Under Direction 56 of the Directions by the Speaker, an adjournment motion always gets precedence over a calling-attention-notice. As you are aware, there is a strike going on in Bombay, and this is because of the failure of Government to evolve a formula for minimum bonus for the employees or workers . . .

MR. SPEAKER : Let him not bring in the subject through a point of order . . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Further, not more than one matter shall be discussed, and the motion shall be restricted to specific matter of recent occurrence . . .

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. He can see me in my chamber. I am prepared to discuss, but not in the House. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Allahabad) : This is a vital matter in which Central

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

Government policy is involved. That is why I want to raise it.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is about the employees of the Corporation of Bombay. How can it come in Parliament ?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai) : The failure of the Central Government is established in regard to the evolution of a bonus formula (*Interruptions*).

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Tomorrow if the port and dock workers go on strike in Bombay, it will have to be raised here.

MR. SPEAKER : So far as this question is concerned, I cannot give my consent to the adjournment motion.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) : May I request that when you are standing, Sir, they must not keep standing ? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Why did he stand up when you are standing ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय राजबहादुर जी ने आपको कोई बुरी बात तो नहीं कही है। उन्होंने सिर्फ यही कहा कि जब मैं खड़ा हूँ तो आप बैठ कर बात किया करें। जब मैं खड़ा हूँ तो आप बैठा करें। लेकिन अब तो ऐसा लगता है कि रूल ही बदलना पड़ेगा कि जब आप खड़े हो तो स्पीकर बैठ जायें।

श्री इसहाक सम्मन्नी (अमरोहा) : माननीय राज बहादुर जी भी तो खड़े थे जब आप बोल रहे थे।

[شہی اسحاق سنہالی (امروہہ) :  
مانندہ راج بہادر جی بھی نو کھڑے تھے  
جب آپ بول رہے تھے]

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन की शकल में नहीं आ सकता। आप मुझ से मेरी चेम्बर में मिल सकते थे मुझसे ही कोई और रास्ता निकल सकता। लेकिन ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन में नहीं आ सकता।

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS rose—

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : No. They can see me in my chamber. But the ruling on the admissibility of the adjournment motion can not be discussed in the House. We can meet and discuss. We can find another way of bringing this issue here, but so far as this matter is concerned, an adjournment motion can not come under this. You can find other ways of bringing the issue here.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I want to know whether raising a point of order is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER : I am not allowing it. I am not prepared to hear him on that. How can they bring in an adjournment motion over a matter over which I cannot decide ? (*Interruptions*). I have already explained it to Prof. Dandavate.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am raising another issue. When I met you in your chamber, I had said something about what is happening in the city of Bombay, how the autonomy of the Corporation is being destroyed. I am not raising that issue here. In my adjournment motion, the failure of the Central Government to evolve an agreed formula in regard to bonus formally in consultation with the central trade unions has resulted in a situation where there may be strikes throughout the country . . .

MR. SPEAKER : No, no.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : This is an all India issue. The Bonus Review Committee is within the purview of the Central Government. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : All I say is that, if the Minister wants he may come out with a statement. If you so desire, this matter can be brought up through call attention motion or something, not through adjournment motion. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Khadlikar has come and I shall explain it to him. They came through an adjournment motion which I have not accepted. The Opposition leaders, Shri Indrajit Gupta, Prof. Dandavate. . . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : All the opposition people. (*Interruptions*.)

MR. SPEAKER : They said that some strike was going on.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : We are not averse to a discussion. The main question is whether it could be discussed in the form

of an adjournment motion. You very rightly said that it could not be discussed that way. Therefore we can discuss it in the Business Advisory Committee.

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** You want the strike to continue ?

**MR. SPEAKER :** You bring in matters which are not within our jurisdiction. . . . (*Interruptions*.)

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :** If it is a matter which does not concern the Central Government, please do not ask us to send tall attention notices. What is the logic ? If we can raise it through other motions, we can raise it through adjournment motion also.

**MR. SPEAKER :** It is not a matter for adjournment motion. . . . (*Interruptions*). Mr. Khadilkar.

**THE MINISTER OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION (SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR) :** I should like to know what is the demand ? . . . (*Interruptions*)

**MR. SPEAKER :** The demand is this, I have not allowed the adjournment motion that came. But they say this concerns the Central Government and the strike is there between the Bombay Corporation and its employees. The second question is the question of bonus, which they say is an all-India question. In the motion that came to me day before yesterday from Mr. Dandavate, only the strike was mentioned, which I did not accept.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :** That is not correct.

**MR. SPEAKER :** They have added this question of bonus today, over which the Government of India has not yet decided. I have not accepted the adjournment motion but I wish you collect the facts about it and come out with a statement.

**SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) :** I do not think hence forward any member of the Opposition is going to be able to convince you about when an adjournment motion should or should not be tabled. Therefore I suggest a drastic change of procedure which will remove the discretion from the hands of the Speaker about giving consent to an adjournment motion.

**MR. SPEAKER :** I am not bound to tell the House the reasons. If the hon. members meet me in my chamber I can tell

them. I convey it to them through the secretariat. They tell them the reasons. (*Interruptions*). Every day we discuss several matters through calling attention motions, under Rule 377 and in so many other ways, which I allow. But an adjournment motion must come within the rules prescribed for it.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) :** This does come.

**MR. SPEAKER :** It does not come. You get so many opportunities in the past members did not get it.

**PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :** Before the Labour Minister makes a statement, we want a categorical formulation. With great respect to you, may I say, I have not raised merely the issue of the Bombay strike ? What I have raised is the failure of the Union Government to evolve an acceptable bonus formula, acceptable to all Central Trade Union Organisations, resulting in country wide discontent amongst industrial labour, as evidenced by the strike of 1.50 lakh workers in Bombay.

**SHRI R. S. PANDEY (Rajmandgaon) :** You have ruled out the adjournment motion. You further said that unless a calling attention is there, the House cannot discuss the Bombay strike. I want to know why you are asking the minister to make a statement. I do not challenge your ruling but when there is no business before the House so far as the strike in Bombay is concerned—there is neither an adjournment motion nor at calling attention now—why are you asking the minister to make a statement ? You have ruled out the adjournment motion on the strike because it is a State subject. About bonus also, there is no calling attention. (*Interruptions*).

**MR. SPEAKER :** My exclusion of the adjournment motion does not deprive them of their right to have some information through other motions. . . . (*Interruptions*). So far as this adjournment motion is concerned, that is excluded. They can get information through Calling Attention or some other way. My disallowing the adjournment motion does not mean that they cannot get it through other means.

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :** How ?

**SHRI JAGANNATH RAO JOSHI (Shajapur) :** Is the Minister making a statement or not ? . . . (*Interruptions*)

**MR. SPEAKER :** So far as matters con-

[Mr. Speaker]

cerning bonus are concerned, which come within the jurisdiction of the Government of India, he may make a statement later on.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Bihar) : Sir, I rise on a point of order. When an adjournment motion was given notice of, you have ruled that it is out of order. Is it then proper, or would it be under the rules for the chair to ask the Minister to make a statement even on facts? The question was raised under rule 377. The rules are absolutely clear in the matter. . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Leaving aside rule 377 if I do not allow an adjournment motion, I can even otherwise ask the Minister to make a statement if hon. Members are agitated over a particular issue. On the question of bonus they have a right to ask the Minister to give some information. But I have made it clear that it would not be an adjournment motion.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Sir, on a point of order. I am sorry to say that what you have said is not correct. Under rule 377 I wanted to raise a matter. You, in your wisdom, disallowed it. Now you are saying "I do not allow the adjournment motion; I will ask the Minister to make a statement".

MR. SPEAKER : Why should I not ask the Minister to make a statement? . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : What is the position of the Minister? Are the Congress Members advising him not to make a statement. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : The INTUC people are pressurizing him not to make a statement. . . (Interruptions.)

MR. SPEAKER : I have said that it is up to the Minister to make a statement.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupusha) : Sir, on a point of clarification. The only rule under which the Minister can make a statement is rule 372. . . (Interruptions).

The point that I want to make is . . . (Interruptions.) I am not going to yield; I am also entitled to make a submission. I shall not be cowed down that way. The only rule under which the Minister is to make a statement is Rule 372. It says :

"A Statement may be made by a Minister on a matter of public importan-

ce with the consent of the Speaker but no questions shall be asked at the time the statement is made."

The question is, whether the Minister is seeking the consent of the Speaker or whether the Speaker is directing the Minister to make a statement. The Minister may seek the consent of the Speaker and the Speaker may give his consent. I want to know whether the Minister is seeking the consent of the Speaker or the Speaker is directing the Minister to make a statement. According to me, the speaker cannot direct the Minister to make a statement (Interruptions).

SHRI JAGDISH CHANDRA DIXIT (Sitapur) : I rise on a point of order.

The question that has been agitated before the House is that of bonus. For that, we can have a discussion under Rule 193 on some day because we would have to go into the pros and cons of everything. But then, just forgetting your ruling. . . (Interruptions). Why are you afraid of going to the field, talking to the persons, looking into the pros and cons. . . (Interruptions). My demand is that let us examine the question of bonus on some day and let us devote half an hour on it. Therefore, I stress that the demand for adjournment motion is neither desirable nor necessary (Interruptions.)

SHRI R. K. KHADILKAR : As you desired I should say something, two points were raised. Firstly, it was regarding the Bombay strike. As you are well aware, the present scheme of bonus does not cover the local authority. The question of the Bombay strike will be dealt with by the appropriate Government, that is, the State Government. This House has no authority so far as the constitutional position is concerned.

Regarding the question of bonus in general, as you are aware, I have replied on several occasions that the entire scheme is for review before the Committee. The Committee is seized of the matter. If somebody raises a question as to whether the Committee will give an interim report or that it will give a final report, what is the position about bonus scheme, if there is notice, I will state the position. At the present juncture, I cannot say anything because the Committee is seized of the matter so far as the bonus scheme is concerned. (Interruptions)

Some Hon. Members then left the House.