

he held at the time of his death. He was also a Member of the Second Lok Sabha during the years 1957-62 and of the Constituent Assembly of India during the years 1946 to 1950 and Minister of Transport and Communications during the years 1959 to 1962. He passed away at Madras on the 6th October, 1962 at the age of 73.

Shri Kameshwara Singh was a Member of the Constituent Assembly of India and of the Provisional Parliament during the years 1946 to 1952. He passed away at Darbhanga on the 1st October, 1962 at the age of 55.

We deeply mourn the loss of these friends and I am sure the House will join me in conveying our condolences to the bereaved families.

The House may stand in silence for a short while to express its sorrow.

The Members then stood in silence for a short while.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SIMPLIFICATION OF PROCEDURE

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that at a meeting which I had yesterday with the leaders and representatives of all the opposition groups in the House and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, some matters relating to simplification of procedure within the existing framework of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha were considered.

The meeting arrived at the following conclusions:

(i) Questions

- (a) For the purpose of answering questions in rotational order, the various Ministries of the Government of India should henceforth be divided into five groups instead of three as

at present. That would mean that questions relating to one Ministry will be answered on one day in a week;

- (b) Not more than five questions, both starred and unstarred combined, by one Member, should be placed on the List of Questions for any one day. Out of these, not more than three questions shall be placed on the list of questions for oral answer.
- (c) Not more than thirty questions should be placed on the List of Questions for oral answer on any one day.

The above changes may be introduced with effect from Monday, the 12th November, 1962.

(2) Private Members' Resolutions

A Member who desires to move a Resolution should in the first instance give written intimation to that effect only. The intimation shall be addressed to the Secretary and left at the Parliamentary Notice Office. The names of Members from whom such intimation is received will be balloted and those securing the first four places in the ballot will be eligible to give notice of one Resolution each. Those Resolutions, if admitted, will be put down in the List of Business.

(3) Amendments to Motions, Resolutions, etc.

In order to limit the number of amendments to Motions or Resolutions each party or group may, if they so desire, table one amendment only in the name of one or several members of the party or group. The present practice whereby a large number of individual Members give notices of separate amendments should be dispensed with.

I take it that the House agrees with these procedural changes and I appeal to the Members to extend their kind co-operation in giving effect to them.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of clarification, Sir, with regard to that part of your announcement where you have just now said, if I heard you aright—I am open to correction—that not more than 30 questions shall be placed on the Starred Questions List for any particular day. What will be the effect of that? You go on receiving questions day after day, hour after hour perhaps, in the Notice Office and the Secretariat examines those questions, and decides to admit them. Suppose after admitting the questions, on a particular day the Secretariat finds that it totals up to more than 30 questions. Then what will happen to the extra questions?

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): They will be treated as Unstarred.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Will they be treated as Unstarred? What will happen to them?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, they will be treated as Unstarred. Even now those that are not answered are already being transferred to the Unstarred list. They will be treated as Unstarred.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West): Perhaps, Sir, inadvertently you have missed to tell the House that this is only an interim arrangement.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; that is what I suppose, unless the House feels that this has worked quite satisfactorily and decides that it should continue.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Barrackpore): I would suggest, Sir, that this may be circulated to hon. Members in the Bulletin.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, we will do that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel that the suggestions that have been made, and possibly with the consent of all the parties, are commendable, and I do

not have much objection to them. But, would there be any objection if we adopt them tomorrow permitting us some chance to make our own suggestions? It may be that we may be able to improve upon these suggestions. We have been taken absolutely by surprise that these are the suggestions you want to adopt as rules for future procedure.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs was there. If any hon. Member of the Congress has any complaint he might convey it to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. He can then come to me and discuss it with me if he finds that there is some difficulty.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We are all anxious, Sir, just as you, no doubt, are, that powers of the Parliament should not be whittled down due to emergency.

Mr. Speaker: There is no power which has been limited.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It should not be whittled down.

Mr. Speaker: No, not at all.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: You are now asking the House to adopt these rules. Before these are adopted I want to make one submission. I submit that these may be adopted tomorrow. Let us have these rules before us. I may have some suggestions to make.

Mr. Speaker: There are no rules that I have placed before you now. The rules are as they are. We have only just modified some procedure that we are following. The rules have not been changed or modified in that context.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: These are amendments of the rules. We may improve upon them. After all, what objection can be there if these are finalised tomorrow?

Shri Bade (Khargone): We may be given some time.

Shri A. K. Sen: *ad interim* order.

Mr. Speaker: If that is the desire, I shall have no objection. I thought there was nothing exceptional. Only some procedure has been simplified. But if it is the desire of the House that it should be taken up tomorrow, I shall have no objection.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, on a separate application that was made to it. Then the appeal has been dismissed. The effect of that dismissal is that any other order that was made by the court would also stand terminated. Whether the order of the High Court, staying the operation of their order of dismissal of the appeal till the 20th November, automatically revives the stay order also? I am doubtful.

12. 08 hrs.

RE: ELECTION OF SHRI G. BASU

The Minister of Law (Shri A. K. Sen): Sir, it will be recalled that the election of Shri Basu was set aside by the Election Tribunal. There was an appeal against that order to the High Court of Calcutta and the High Court by its order in the appeal itself dated 11th August, 1962 stayed the operation of the order setting aside the election to the extent of enabling him to attend Lok Sabha until the hearing of the appeal. That means it is an *ad interim* stay pending the hearing of the appeal. The appeal was dismissed on 27th September, 1962. After the dismissal of the appeal the original stay order would have automatically stood terminated. Thereupon, the counsel for Shri Basu applied to the court for stay of the operation of the order dismissing the appeal. It was accordingly stayed until the 20th November 1962, that is, 20th of November next. The effect of it is, therefore, as if the appeal has not been heard and, therefore, the original stay order continues until the 20th of November 1962 and he would be entitled to attend the Lok Sabha until the 20th November 1962 unless there is a further stay order from a higher court.

Shri A. K. Sen: It is not a question of revival because that stay order would have come to an end unless the court stayed the operation of the order dismissing the appeal. It is not a question of revival of the order until the dismissal of the appeal because the order of dismissal remains stayed. Therefore, there is no dismissal.

Mr. Speaker: The appeal has been dismissed. It has been disposed of and nothing remains of the appeal. Now it is only an application for leave to appeal to the Supreme Court.

Shri A. K. Sen: The dismissal would have taken effect if there was no order staying the order of dismissal.

Mr. Speaker: If the House agrees with that view, I have no objection, I will put it to the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We are not able to understand the niceties of the law.

Mr. Speaker: Then the papers would be circulated so that hon. Members may be aware of the implications of this matter.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I would like to have one clarification.

Mr. Speaker: We are circulating the papers. He might study them.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: While circulating the paper probably the hon. Minister will indicate only what he has stated before the House today. I

Mr. Speaker: I would like to have one point clarified. The appeal was filed before the High Court and a stay order was issued by that court that till the disposal of that appeal Shri Basu would be entitled to sit in the House. That was a separate order.