

[Shri Hem Barua]

tutional right to co-operate with them and received arms and ammunitions from enemy countries like Pakistan and China. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Is there something more or can I proceed (*Interruption*). Order, order. There ought to be an end to this.

Shri Hem Barua: There is an end, Sir.

Shrimati Renuka Barkataki (Barteta): We are happy to know from the Prime Minister that the Government has taken necessary precautions. But I would like to know whether the Government is aware of the fact that after the withdrawal of our security forces and army from Assam-Nagaland border and Assam-Manipur border without making adequate police arrangements for the security of property and lives in the villages in those border areas, there has been some sort of a widespread feeling of panic and insecurity in the minds of the villagers and increasing recalcitrance on the part of the Naga hostiles.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: So far as the security forces are concerned, they are there in Nagaland and on the borders. The responsibility of guarding our frontiers and borders is naturally that of the security forces. If there is any special difficulty, we are prepared to look into them. But I have no doubt that the security of that area and the people living there will be fully watched and we will see that no one is harassed and no incident takes place.

12.50 hrs.

RE. DEATH OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN ANDHRA PRADESH BY TAKING CARE MID-DAY MEALS

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni): Sir, I would like to make a submission. Some days ago you were pleased to instruct the Education Minister to gather facts from the State Govern-

ment regarding the tragic death of so many school children in Andhra State. It is seen from the press reports that the Committee appointed to go into the matter has already submitted a report to the State Government. I would like to know whether we will get any information on the subject.

Mr. Speaker: The Education Minister is not present here in the House at the moment. So, it could not be taken up now.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE—Contd.

SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT *re*. U.P.
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY V. JUDGES OF THE
ALLAHABAD HIGH COURT

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Law to the opinion given by the Supreme Court in the case of U.P. Legislative Assembly *vs*. Judges of Allahabad High Court upholding the action of the judiciary.

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): I do not really know what answer the hon. Member seeks to elicit from me excepting that I can only give in a summary form what the conclusions of the Supreme Court have been.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: That must have been read by every one. What is it that Shri Banerjee wants to know?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to know the reaction of the Government, because....

Mr. Speaker: It is too soon now.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me. I would not have asked for this reply immediately but since on the 3rd the session is coming to an end, he should make a statement at least on the 3rd, because our privileges have been dashed to the ground....

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): No, no.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What is this "No, no"? Shri Gajendragadhkar has given the judgment. We want to know whether the Government contemplate amending the Constitution or codifying the privileges....

Mr. Speaker: Shri Banerjee should realise that it is too early for Government to give an opinion.

Shri Daji: Our session will end on the 3rd. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. So many Members are standing and speaking at the same time.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I submit one thing?

Mr. Speaker: I cannot allow him a speech. If he wants and puts a question, I will ask the Minister to reply to it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My fear is only this.

Mr. Speaker: I am not concerned with his fear at the moment. He might put his question.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I put my question?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I have asked him thrice to put his question.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have never seen a calling attention notice being admitted without the Minister giving a reply. It has been admitted and yet the Minister is not prepared to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker: What is it that the Minister should say? The pronouncement has been read by every one. If he simply wants to know what the decision has been, the Minister can give it. Does he want the Minister to read it?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me. I am not asking him to read the judgment. What is the position in U.P.? In the U.P. Legislative Assembly almost all the MLAs, excepting one, have clearly decided that the House was not bound by the verdict of the Supreme Court and that there

is going to be a meeting of Speakers of Legislatures convened by you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Is his question whether I am presiding? He asked me whether he could put a question. I asked him to put his question more than once.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Is the Government aware that there is a move by the Members of the U.P. Legislative Assembly in consultation with the Speaker of Lok Sabha to convene a meeting, to be presided over by the Speaker of the Lok Sabha?

Mr. Speaker: How can Government say whether it is true or not? I am very sorry, such questions are asked—there is a news item that the Speaker has been consulted and, therefore, a question is asked of the Government whether the Speaker has been consulted.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: They are going to convene a meeting.

Mr. Speaker: They may do it.

Shri Mohammad Elias (Howrah): Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri Mohammad Elias: Why has this Calling Attention Notice been admitted?

Mr. Speaker: I have to say something on this?

Shri Mohammad Elias: Yes, you have to say something on this. If the Government has nothing to say, then why was this calling attention notice admitted? The calling attention notice is generally admitted in consultation with the Minister.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): No, no.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Happily, the Lok Sabha, as represented by you, did not associate itself with the proceedings which took place before the Supreme Court. But it was on the initiative of the Presi-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

dent's advisers that the Supreme Court had been asked to give its opinion in regard to this matter. The President's advisers being the Government, perhaps we have a right to know what exactly was in the mind of the Government at the time of sending it to the Supreme Court for this kind of advice and how they are going to proceed in view of what has happened and in view also of the feeling amongst legislators that their privileges should remain unaffected?

Mr. Speaker: That is a question which I can ask the Minister to reply.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah (Adoni): Mr. Speaker, may I...

Mr. Speaker: Let the first question be answered. Then we will see the next question.

Shri Frank Anthony: Before that, may I make a submission? (*Interruptions*).

An Hon. Member: Let the Minister answer the question first.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Why should there be such a row on this?

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): Before that reply has come, another Member wanted....

Mr. Speaker: One question has been put by Shri Mukerjee which I have considered as in order. I have asked the Minister to reply to it. Let that reply come.

Shri Frank Anthony: Before a reply is given, may I....

Shri K. D. Malaviya: He must sit down.

Shri Frank Anthony: My question is this.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Sir, is it not our right to point out what you have just now stated, that no Member has the right to interfere when you have asked the Minister to reply to a question?

Shri Frank Anthony: Sir, I am entirely in your hands.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. Regarding Shri Frank Anthony, he is a senior advocate of the Supreme Court. Let us hear him.... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Frank Anthony rose—

Shri K. D. Malaviya: It is very unfair for another hon. Member to stand up or say something when you have asked the Minister to answer a particular question.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Will all hon. Members kindly sit down. I do not follow what the objection is. One question has been put and I have said it is in order. I am going to ask the Minister to reply to it. Why should there be impatience if Shri Frank Anthony wants to put in something for my guidance? (*Interruptions*).

Shri K. D. Malaviya: We want to hear the answer of the Minister.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Every one has to sit down when I am standing.

An Hon. Member: Including Shri Frank Anthony.

Shri Frank Anthony: I merely wanted to submit.... (*Interruptions*).

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं, माननीय सदस्य बैठ जाएं। इस वक्त मैं व्यवस्था का प्रश्न सुनने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ।

Shri Frank Anthony: It is not only premature.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Let the Minister answer the question.

Shri A. K. Sen: Mr. Speaker, there were two questions asked by Shri

Mukerjee. The first was what impelled the Government to seek the opinion of the Supreme Court. The circumstances are fairly well-known. An unfortunate conflict has arisen over a certain committal proceeding in which the Speaker of the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha was personally involved and an order was made committing a gentleman for contempt of the Uttar Pradesh Vidhan Sabha. Certain proceedings were taken at the instance of that person before the Lucknow Bench of the Allahabad High Court. The Lucknow Bench entertained the petition and ordered interim relief for the person concerned. Thereupon, various other proceedings took place, both in the Allahabad High Court before a Full Bench and also in the Vidhan Sabha. This was such an unfortunate conflict, which touched the very core of our Constitution, as between two organs of Government, between which according to us there should be no conflict whatsoever, and the only course that the President thought was possible under the circumstances was to seek the opinion of the Supreme Court on the questions of law which were involved, namely, the jurisdictions respectively of the Vidhan Sabha and also of the High Court, or rather the judiciary. That also involved an interpretation of the role of the Supreme Court in the matter, the existence of the privileges which are enjoyable by the legislatures in the States and the Parliament here, as also the question as to how far the courts could invade the arena of the Parliament and the Legislatures as regards the interpretation and as regards the question of the existence of the privileges of the legislature.

13 hrs.

Shri Frank Anthony: No question of invasion.

Shri A. K. Sen: Either it is super-
vision or invasion. (*Interruption*).
Let us not quarrel over words,
because even in forensic language it
may be proved as invasion of the
court into areas which are claimed to

be the exclusive privileges of the
legislature. There is no moral turpi-
tude involved in the expression—just
as the executive sometimes invades
the arena of the individual.

Now, that conflict could only be
resolved, according to the Govern-
ment, by a reference to the Supreme
Court and by an interpretation of the
respective spheres of the judiciary
and the legislatures and Parliament
as regards this very important ques-
tion of privilege, including the power
to commit a person for contempt of
the legislature.

Of the five questions that were
referred, four were specific and the
fifth was of a general nature. The
Supreme Court has answered all the
five questions, and all in favour of
the judiciary. (*An Hon. Member:*
Naturally!) I agree with some hon.
Members who have said that there
have been certain reports in the
papers suggesting as if some Members
have expressed a view that they were
not bound by the opinion of the
Supreme Court.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):
We are a sovereign body; the Parlia-
ment is sovereign.

Shri A. K. Sen: Well, instead of
criticising anyone, I personally feel
that a restrained attitude, both by
members of the legislature as also by
members of the judiciary, would be
the best course possible.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Are you going
to advise the U.P. Legislative Assem-
bly?

Shri A. K. Sen: They have their
own Law Minister, and they have
their own legal advisers, and I am
not going to advise any one volun-
tarily. (*Interruption*). I shall be
only at the service of you, Sir, and
the House.

Therefore, Sir, in my submission
the Supreme Court has given its
verdict.....

**Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore
City):** Opinion.

Shri A. K. Sen: It is a verdict.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: There is a difference between opinion and verdict. I am very sorry to say, it can never be a verdict.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri A. K. Sen: Technically it is not a verdict, but in substance it is, because whenever a dispute goes to any court....

Shri Hanumanthaiya: It is not a question of....

Mr. Speaker: It cannot be resolved in this manner. Let us hear him.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: When the Law Minister uses an incorrect phraseology committing this House, we cannot allow it to go. Kindly hear me for one minute.

Mr. Speaker: When Mr. Anthony stood up there was objection that he should not be heard.

Shri Frank Anthony: Exactly, when I wanted to place before the House something which would have put the whole thing in perspective.

Shri A. K. Sen: Technically the opinion of the Supreme Court is not a verdict, just as the Privy Council's opinion is an opinion to His Majesty the King.

Shri Daji: No, no, there is no parallel here.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Sir, you may kindly give me a minute later and I will show how the Law Minister is wrong. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: I do not follow what the House wants now. Does it want a discussion?

Shri Daji: Yes, Sir, it is very important. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What is the reaction of the Government in this respect, if the House wants a discussion on it?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: Sir, the legal implications, of course, will be

better understood by the Law Minister and others who are legal people here, experts. But may I say a word, that this is a very important occasion, and important judgment? We cannot come to any conclusion so soon over it and in a hurry. I have had talks even with the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh, and my advice has been that this matter, all its implications, should be very carefully examined before we take up any particular attitude. I would, therefore, Sir, request that time should be given to us—to the Government as well as to the State Governments—and then we would be in a position to come to a definite conclusion. I do not think it could be discussed on the 3rd. If there is anything, perhaps it may have to be discussed or a statement made by the Government during the next session.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: A special session is being convened in U.P.

Mr. Speaker: There is one thing I have to bring to the notice of the hon. Prime Minister and the Leader of the House. As soon as this was announced, the Members of the Legislatures, and more specially the presiding officers, have felt very much perturbed over it. And if we do not give them any guidance, probably they might express themselves in such manner that might not be conducive to the atmosphere. As has been said by Mr. Banerjee, already that Legislature has said: we will fight, we will not wait, or we will do this or we will do that. If other Legislatures also begin to say like that, or they call a meeting of the presiding officers..... (*Interruption*) and then they pass any resolutions or do certain things, that would not be fair. Therefore, from the Central Government some guidance or something must be given so that there might not be any atmosphere which might just injure us or harm the interests which we hold so very dear in order to see that harmony between the different wings is maintained.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It is what has appeared in the newspapers,

and from the press reports it seems that the Speaker of the Uttar Pradesh Assembly has only said that the matter is under the consideration of the Privileges Committee which was set up. One of the Members—the name is not mentioned in the paper, but it is said that one of the Members—has said that “we are not prepared to accept the opinion given by the Supreme Court”.

However, with due apologies, the Speakers who hold such eminent position cannot jump to conclusions so quickly over these matters. They are men, I mean they hold such responsible position that they would also like to give thought to it. It may take even a few days. But I would only like to add that we can give advice, we will of course give advice, to the State Governments, and if it is necessary we can also give advice to the Speakers....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How can you advise the Speakers?

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: We cannot do it; therefore I myself was rather careful about it. But to the State Governments, as I said, we can certainly give them advice. But the present advice would only be to wait in patience at least for a week or so. This matter has to be carefully examined. I suggested to the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh that they should not come to a quick decision or any conclusion. I am prepared, I said, we will meet here if necessary and discuss these matters.

So, Sir, my request is that we should be given some time. We would be most willing to advise the State Governments after consulting them. Even the Law Minister, he will also deal with this matter as he thinks fit.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What about our views?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Mr. Speaker, as I wrote to you....

Shri A. K. Sen: Sir, I have not finished yet. I had a few words to add when you called upon me.

What I was going to say was that undoubtedly the opinion of the Supreme Court will have the effect of causing a deep erosion into the privileges as we have known them to be and recognised them to be from the precedents of the House of Commons in England. The effect of it will have to be studied, as the hon Prime Minister said, with very great care. We will have to see how much of the erosion would have to be repaired, if at all, for the purpose of allowing us to function here and allowing you, most of all, to conduct the proceedings of the House and your counterparts in the legislatures to do so. That is not a matter which we can decide all of a sudden. But the fact is—let us be quite frank about it—that the Supreme Court judgment has caused a very great erosion into the privileges.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Railways (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): Invasion.

Shri A. K. Sen: I am not using that expression because of Shri Frank Anthony.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: In this regard when I wrote to you this morning I had clearly stated in my letter—and I hold the same opinion now—that I do feel—I will not go into the merits of the case whatsoever—that we owe a responsibility to ourselves and to the country in this matter and we cannot ignore the ramifications and the implications of this judgment which is of a very historical nature. I will not even go to the extent to which the hon. Law Minister has gone in spelling out the implications and of saying whether our rights have been corroded or not; but we do feel deeply concerned regarding the proceedings which have got to follow and what our own rights are. Therefore, at the present moment I am only concerned with what is going to be our line of action.

[Shri Harish Chandra Mathur]

The hon. Prime Minister has asked for a week's time. But Parliament will go out of the session on the 3rd and then we will not be able to meet; but it is the duty of this Parliament—and the Members very reasonably feel exercised—to chalk out a line of action which we are going to follow, whether we are going to consign this matter to the Privileges Committee of this House or whether we are going to discuss this matter.

An Hon. Member: The whole House should consider it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is very necessary that all the leaders of the Opposition, the legal luminaries and the Leader of the House must immediately go into a meeting, as a matter of fact. They must decide upon a future line of action which will be acceptable to this House. This House may not express any opinion but this House must decide by the 3rd as to what is going to be the line of action which this House and the Members of Parliament are going to adopt.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): May I draw your kind attention to the fact that yourself and this House are more or less a party to this decision because we were served with a notice by the Supreme Court and we had decided to abide by the judgment.....

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: I do not say that we have decided to abide by the judgment.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. That is very sad. If we cannot conduct ourselves in an orderly manner then, perhaps, the Supreme Court shall have to decide how we should conduct ourselves.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: What I meant to convey was simply this that when we decided not to file

a formal appearance, we had at least expressed a desire to put our implicit faith in the verdict of the Supreme Court.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: The only course which, I suggest, is open to this House is immediately to establish a special committee under the Speaker's direction to go into the whole question and suggest whatever remedial measures it can by way of amending the Constitution or by way of certain measures which are essential because to consign the matter to the Privileges Committee, when the privileges have in fact been wiped out, would be doing a distinct dis-courtesy to the Privileges Committee.

Mr. Speaker: I have heard him; but I must repudiate his statement that we submitted to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): Looking to the importance and implications of this question may I suggest that we extend the session by a day or two and discuss this matter before we disperse finally so that we can decide upon the course of action to be followed.

Shri Frank Anthony: I merely wanted to endorse the plea made by the Leader of the House. I also am exercised by the judgment but that is no reason for my entering a precipitate opinion which might be considered to be irresponsible and gratuitous reflection on the supreme judiciary of this country. All I want to say is this that I do not agree with the way the Law Minister has put it. It is wrong—that is my first impression—for anyone, however strongly we may feel, I do not think that we can say so now absolutely, to say that this is in any way an erosion of our privileges. The Supreme Court has made this very clear. They have merely said that this is not a question of a conflict between the legislature and the judiciary. They have

said, "We were asked and we were bound to interpret the Constitution which is sovereign and we have interpreted it. We have accorded primacy to the Constitution". In my humble opinion, quite rightly, they have accorded primacy to the fundamental right of the citizen.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Frank Anthony: What they have said is that your privileges must submit to article 32 of the Constitution which keeps paramount the fundamental right of the citizen. That is all that they have said.

An Hon. Member: We do not agree with that.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): You remember, Sir, that I had suggested on that day that we might sit on Friday. Though it is Gandhiji's birthday, I do not remember any occasion on which Gandhiji took rest. Our late Prime Minister also said that we must work. I think, it will be a very good example. There are many interesting questions in this session. If we sit tomorrow, nothing will be lost. I am sure, Gandhiji's soul will be happy if we worked tomorrow.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): There are no two opinions that a matter of this importance should be discussed in this House. It has agitated the mind of everybody. Until and unless our privileges are clarified, it is very difficult for us to function. So, I submit that at least this matter may be referred to the Privileges Committee.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri P. K. Deo: Let it be known that we are anxious to get our privileges defined.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Sir, I agree with the hon. Prime Minister that we should not get excited over this matter. We must consider this question with great restraint. It is not the question of legislature *versus* the courts. We are evolving the Constitution to function and its practices and we must so evolve them as to

see that there is harmonious working of all organs of government. What I suggest is this. The Privileges Committee is constituted for a particular purpose with restricted scope, that is, for considering various questions that arise in this House. This is an unusual question. You are the custodian of the rights and the dignity of this House. The hon. Prime Minister is the Leader of the House. He is not merely the leader of the party but according to constitutional practice, he is the Leader of the House. So, I make this suggestion that both of you think together and evolve a formula for procedure. I am not asking for a decision on the subject matter. I am requesting both of you to formulate a procedure so that we can take a decision ultimately through that procedure as early as possible. The time asked for by the hon. Prime Minister is only one week. It is very reasonable and we agree to it. All that I suggest is that you take into confidence the leaders of the Opposition parties and the Leader of the House and evolve a procedure; otherwise, as some of my hon. friends said, this question is going to be discussed and is being discussed in a controversial manner throughout India and in every legislature. So, it is up to you, as the Speaker of the Lok Sabha—as I said once in my speech, this House is the repository and the representative of the sovereignty of the people of India—to take that responsibility and give guidance to the whole country.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee rose—

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): Sir, I require a minute.

Mr. Speaker: There are so many Members. If I allow him, why not allow others also?

Shri Thirumala Rao: I want to draw the attention of the House to one point that has not been mentioned at all.

Mr. Speaker: I am requesting the hon. Members to listen to me first and then if they want to continue, they might continue.

[Mr. Speaker]

It is very unfortunate that such a situation has arisen. We have, as we ought to have, always respected all the observations that have been made by the Supreme Court and we assure the country that we will continue to do that because unless that is done, this democracy cannot work.

It has been stressed therein that we are not sovereign, that the Constitution is sovereign. Nobody has ever doubted it. But the Constitution is sovereign not only for the legislature but it is also sovereign for the judiciary. Whatever rights have been given to one wing must be respected by the other also. If any interpretation is put on a provision of the Constitution which really, as has been said by the Law Minister, is likely to invade into the province of another wing, that would be rather unfortunate for the country and would create complications. I am not commenting on the judgment that has been given. Mr. Anthony has argued that they have only interpreted the Constitution and done nothing further, that, so far as it stands, they have said that this is the interpretation that can be put on it. But what the intention of the Constituent Assembly was would be clear by four lines which I shall read now. Mr. Ambedkar had said:

"For instance, under the House of Commons rules and privileges, it is open to Parliament to convict any citizen for contempt of Parliament and when such privilege is exercised, the jurisdiction of the court is ousted."

That is an important privilege that was intended. . . .

Shri Shinkre (Marmagao): May I submit. . . .

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Either you allow us to have a discussion. . . .

Some Hon. Members: Listen to the Speaker first.

Mr. Speaker: I do not understand what objection Mr. Banerjee has. He was just taking up and advocating the privileges of the Parliament and now he just criticises. I do not understand it. I am only saying what the intention of the Constituent Assembly at that time was. Whether that intention has been expressed adequately in the Constitution or not, whether the words used are not adequate to express that intention, is a different thing altogether. And it would be for this House or for the Government to decide whether the intention that was really in the minds of the Constitution makers has adequately been conveyed and if according to the present construction put by the Supreme Court it has not been so done in the words that have been used, then the Government or this House shall have to think whether the Constitution is to be amended. This is what I am saying. If the Constituent Assembly has not been able to express them in suitable words and the Supreme Court has found it difficult just to interpret it in the manner that was just conceived by our Constitution makers, then it is for us now and this Government to consider and come to a conclusion whether really there is a need to amend the Constitution.

I only read one line from May's:

"The power of commitment is truly described as the key-stone of parliamentary privilege."

If that power is not there, then the authority and the dignity of the Parliament is gone. It is on that account that I am appealing to the Government that they must give their serious consideration to the interpretation that has been put; whether it is a dictum or decision or advice, or whatever it is, it has its own significance and implications and we have to look into it. Therefore, it was that I brought to the notice of the Prime Minister that the Government has to consider it very seriously.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee rose—

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Speaker: Would it not be better that we stop here? Would it not be advisable if we stop here?

13.24 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ANNUAL REPORT OF ALL INDIA INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL SCIENCES FOR THE YEAR 1963-64.

The Minister of Works and Housing (Shri Mehr Chand Khanna): Sir, on behalf of Dr. Sushila Nayar, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Annual Report of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, for the year 1963-64 under section 19 of the All India Institute of Medical Sciences Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3293/64]

श्री मौर्य (अलीगढ़) : सूचना के आधार पर एक निवेदन है कि देश के कोने कोने से बम्बई से, मद्रास से, मद्रास से, मैसूर से, उत्तर प्रदेश से, पंजाब से, राजस्थान से, मध्य प्रदेश से, हिमाचल प्रदेश से तथा अन्य दूर-दूर के स्थानों से शोषित समाज के लोग पार्लियामेंट के बाहर भारी संख्या में अपनी मांगें प्रस्तुत करने के लिए एकत्र हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि माननीय अध्यक्ष इस सदन के कुछ सदस्यों को उनसे मिलने के लिए बाहर भेजने की कृपा करें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठ जाएं, अभी तक ऐसा कर्मी नहीं किया गया। यहाँ इतनी मुश्किलात हैं, अन्दर की बात ही नहीं संभाल सकते, बाहर की बात का तो सवाल ही पैदा नहीं होता।

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE—
Contd.

NOTIFICATION No. G.S.R. 1329 UNDER CENTRAL EXCISE DUTIES EXPORT DRAWBACK (GENERAL) RULES, 1960 ETC.

The Minister of Planning (Shri B. R. Bhagat): I beg to lay on the Table—

(i) a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 1329 dated the 19th Sep-

tember, 1964, making certain further amendment to the Customs and Central Excise Duties Export Drawback (General) Rules, 1960, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 and section 39 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3294/64].

(ii) a copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:—

(a) G.S.R. 1330 dated the 19th September, 1964.

(b) G.S.R. 1401 dated the 24th September, 1964.
[Placed in Library. See No. LT-3295/64].

(iii) a copy of Notification No. 10/64 dated the 19th September, 1964, making certain amendments to the General Regulations of the Industrial Finance Corporation of India, under sub-section (3) of section 43 of the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3296/64].

(iv) a copy of Annual Report of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation for the year 1963-64 along with the Audited Accounts, under sub-section (2) of section 32 of the Agricultural Refinance Corporation Act, 1963. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-3297/64].

OPINIONS ON BILL

Shri Shree Narayan Das (Darbhanga): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table Paper No. II to the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India which was circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the direction of the House on the 22nd November, 1963.

13.26 hrs.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

(i) 'In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule