

Mr. Speaker: The rule is clear. There is no ambiguity about it.

Shri Joachim Alva: We are small fry. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: Small fry do not do like that. It is admitted on all hands—he must have no doubts—that he is not a small fry but a big fish.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

“That the respective sums not exceeding the amounts shown in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands Nos. 11, 12, 13 and 116 relating to the Ministry of Economic and Defence Coordination.

The motion was adopted.

The motions for Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced below.—Ed.

DEMAND No. 11—MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC AND DEFENCE CO-ORDINATION

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 15,41,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of ‘Ministry of Economic and Defence Co-ordination’.”

DEMAND No. 12—SUPPLIES AND DISPOSALS

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,94,81,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in

respect of ‘Supplies and Disposals’.”

DEMAND No. 13—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC AND DEFENCE CO-ORDINATION

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 52,15,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of ‘Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Economic and Defence Co-ordination’.”

DEMAND No. 116—CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF ECONOMIC AND DEFENCE CO-ORDINATION

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 92,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of ‘Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Economic and Defence Co-ordination’.”

15.44 hrs.

DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand No. 108 relating to the Department of Parliamentary Affairs.

DEMAND No. 108—DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

“That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,90,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which

will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of Affairs'."

There is real jubilation that this is the first time that we are discussing this Ministry.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Second time.

Mr. Speaker: Then Mr. Kamath left us and, therefore, there was the interval. Now he has come again and so we are taking it up again.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): It was casually taken up in the course of the supplementary demands; not the demands proper.

Mr. Speaker: He is right in that respect. So, this is the first time that we are discussing this Ministry. It is on that account that we have allowed a small period this time. We will enhance it next time when we discuss it.

Does Mr. Kamath want to move his cut motion?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Demand under the head Department of Parliamentary Affairs be reduced by Rs. 100."

[Need for more efficient planning of Government legislative and other business for the Sessions of Lok Sabha(1)].

Sir, I request that the time may be extended to 2 hours. We have to discuss the demands for grants of the Finance Ministry today upto 6.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: The Finance Ministry has to be given six hours—one hour today and five hours tomorrow. Tomorrow at 17.00 hrs. we have to put the demands to the vote of the House. We have now got 1 hour and 15 minutes and that should be enough.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We might sit up to 6.30 p.m. today.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Members do not desire. The Members should restrain themselves from making long speeches.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This is the first time that we are discussing it. The time is short.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore, there would be short speeches. Shri H. N. Mukerjee.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a rare pleasure as you have already indicated and I am sure that the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs would participate in the debate in the spirit in which we also are participating.

Mr. Speaker: Exactly at 16.45 hrs. I would be calling the Hon. Minister.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You may kindly call him at 5.00 p.m. It is our request.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Sir, in the House we learn a great deal and I remember how Sir William Anson who wrote on the Law and Custom of the Constitution, after he became a Member of the House of Commons discovered a great deal of what he never knew before. In this House, for instance, we learn from books that the Speaker never speaks but we discover that the Speaker has to speak copiously ~~sometimes~~ at the cost of his lungs, outsoaring the din that prevails from time to time.

Mr. Speaker: That is only under compulsion, not voluntarily.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know, Sir, I said, 'has to speak'.

Our hon. friend, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs, for instance, has a splendid speaking voice and there is no comparable inhibition on him. But except on Fridays when with trepidation he announces the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

programme for the next week or so, he hardly speaks. But he knows at the same time that whenever he speaks he gets applause. Even when he opens his mouth and puts his foot into it, the applause follows. I do not know in my experience of any other Member of Parliament who has had the distinction of being applauded every time he opens his lips.

In any case, our Minister has a job of work to do and in a manner of speaking he does it well. In England the Chief Whip is a powerful political personality who is consulted by the Prime Minister on even Cabinet appointments. I do not quite know how powerful our Minister is in relation to his party colleagues. But he has been in Parliamentary life since perhaps the middle-thirties and he is now a Member of the Cabinet for which I congratulate him. He should have been a Member of the Cabinet a long time ago.

I found in a book written by our Ambassador in Iraq, a very dear friend of mine, who has been a member of this House for ten years, Shri Sadath Ali Khan, a reference, which I found to be very handy, to our Minister and the work he does. I am quoting from his book *Brief Thanksgiving*. At page 54 he writes about him in a very complimentary fashion. I am quoting:

"A three-line whip from the popular Chief Whip and Minister of Parliamentary Affairs Mr. Satyanarayan Sinha crowds the Chamber with Congress M.P.'s."

Now-a-days, I am afraid that a three-line whip or an oral injunction does not seem to crowd the House with Congress M.P.'s, and instances have occurred when in spite of the bell ringing and the Chief Whip and his deputies running about the place, this House could not be filled, and our friend Shri Kamath only a little while ago got up one day to insist that there should not be a division

and there was no division. And that was a rightful demand.

What I mean to say is that it is the job of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs functioning as he does to ensure, and he can ensure with the serried ranks behind him, attendance in this House, but he cannot often do so, even though I am told in this book that a three-line whip—I do not know if he sends out four—or five—line whips, now which nobody reads because of the length—once upon a time did the trick of making Members come to the House.

This book goes on to say:

"Mr. Satyanarayan Sinha, an experienced parliamentarian is ubiquitous. Perhaps, by nature restless, he gives the impression of being in two places at the same time. He is exquisitely dressed and has a fondness for heavy Indian perfumes."

Referring to me also, he says:

"Once the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party, Shri Hiren Mukerjee...."

Mr. Speaker: His official duties should be discussed, not his personal things.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Referring to me also,—a very irreverent Member—he says:

"Once the Deputy Leader of the Communist Party, Shri Hiren Mukerjee referred to him as the musk deer. The wits also call him His Fragrance. But Mr. Sinha is incapable of an ill-natured retort, for which everyone regardless of party affiliations respects him."

Apart from respect, we all like him, a much more important matter, but we like him to organise his work a little better than he has done so far.

Shri Joachim Alva: I think my hon. friend should also quote from the penderous book on *The Indian Parliament* where the Minister has been referred to in a very complimentary manner. It was written by Mr. Morris-Jones, a British political professor who came here. He has made a laudatory reference to the hon. Minister.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am also referring to the hon. Minister in very complimentary terms, I have said just now—perhaps my hon. friend did not hear me—that we have not only respect for him, but we all like him.

Mr. Speaker: Only the perfume was extraneous; all other things were relevant.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I referred to the perfume because on so many occasions we fight in this House; then we go out and we shake hands and after the hand-shake, the perfume also lasts for quite some time.

If I may borrow from the vocabulary which I have associated very often with Shri Kamath, a every good friend of mine, I may perhaps say in a more serious way that there has been on the part of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs consistent, persistent and insistent failure in arranging smoothly the business of Parliament. And I wish to say that he should not blame Members of Parliament who sit on this side, Mr. Kamath or me here because it is not our business. I know that we also have a responsibility in keeping quorums and that sort of thing. But when the Government has such a massive majority, it is not entirely our business. It is the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs' headache. Then again, in Parliament, we are bound to have all varieties of people, and when I think of my very dear friend Shri Kamath, I think also of his former chief, the great Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, and I am reminded of what I had read a long time ago, that there are two

sorts of people; some are born to shake empires, and some to move amendments, and Mr. Kamath has such a flair for moving amendments that here in this House... (*Laughter*).

In any case, if we only think of the few days ahead of us, only the other day the Minister told us that the House would rise on the 4th of May. If only we think of the number of hours available or given to us by God, sunlight and all the rest of it, and compare it with the number of hours already allotted and to be allotted to such things as the Hindi Bill which was brought up by Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri the other day, then there is a discrepancy. Already there is this discrepancy, and I am sure Mr. Kamath is going to refer to it in greater detail.

If I give another instance, this question of the standing committee on public enterprises as been a fiasco for quite such a long time, and only the other day, on Mr. Kamath's insistence, you were pleased to observe that this matter is hanging fire for far too long and something should be done about it. And I do not quite understand why the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs who is so popular, who commands so much strength, should be so shaky and so jumpy about what the other House is going to do. Is not the Congress Party a unified party? Has not the Congress Party support in both House of Parliament? Cannot the Congress Party secure the support of this House and the other House to an agreed process of activity in regard to the setting up of a parliamentary body to look after these statutory corporations? Why should the Parliamentary Minister exhibit this fear of the other House? Even in regard to budget discussions, the general discussion started in the other House first, because the Parliamentary Minister came and told us that there was no work for the other House to do. Was that an argument? Is the other House to be summoned and given jobs even though there is no work for

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

them to do,—and we have to go out of the way, we in the Lok Sabha to which alone the Ministers are responsible, have to go out of the way to accommodate the other House? I do not wish to say anything in disrespect of the other House.

Mr. Speaker: That does raise controversies when we discuss those things here; and they find opportunities for discussion, and this chain goes on, and we have already seen.....

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): That House should be abolished.

Mr. Speaker: . . . that when once this chain starts, there is no end to it. Therefore, we ought to exercise some restraint on ourselves.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am personally prepared to exercise all the restraint in the world, but it is rather difficult when the Government here the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs goes there and takes his seat just like that. When he has got his party commanding a majority, a comfortable majority and a convincing majority in this House as well as in that House, this sort of thing happens.

My grouse is not against the Rajya Sabha. My grouse is against the Government of this country which is controlling the majority in both Houses of Parliament and is not able to bring both Houses of Parliament to a concordant mood, in so far as the proposal of Government itself is concerned. That is why we feel from time to time that Government has even to consider the idea of examining how far these Second Chambers including the other House are superfluous or not. I have to say this not because I have any animus against the other House. Our own party people are represented there fairly effectively, and I have, therefore, no animus against the other House. I want also that it should continue as a forum where the people's aspiration can be expressed. But I do want Government to function in a very much more effective fashion, and

that is the job of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

I know that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on one occasion said in a very disarming fashion,—which is why we like him; I have no time to quote from this—he said on the 8th March, 1963: 'You just tell us what we can do'. That was the way he put it. He makes a mollifying statement of that sort. But it does not absolve the Minister of responsibility.

I say also that the Minister has the responsibility and the obligation of having more serious consultations with Opposition Groups. When you, Sir, were elected as the Deputy-Speaker, you were a Member of the Opposition. I do not want to rake up old history, but at any rate, we thought that better conventions were going to be started. But every time there is the election of the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker, the Opposition Parties in this House bring up this matter that there is no prior consultation and there is not even an idea ever of having a Member of the Opposition elected to high offices comparable to those of the Speaker and of the Deputy-Speaker.

Then, again, all of us in this House have been disturbed by the phenomenon of scenes being perpetrated. The other day, for instance, something happened about which we are all rather ashamed; all of us have to share the obloquy of what happened. We cannot merely ask a few people to go or suspend them from membership. After all, the stain touches us also. I do have a feeling that it is the job of the Parliamentary Minister to have prior consultation with all groups, to anticipate difficulties, and especially, in difficult circumstances, to meet people, to talk to them and find out what can be done.

The other day, for instance, after the Socialists and their colleagues walked out—we now discover Shri

Frank Anthony, who is not here, thumping about the place. We get a peculiar phenomenon of the *angrezi hatao* people on the one side and the *angrezi chatao* people on the other carrying on a controversy, while, if there was previous consultation initiated with people on this side specially when a thing like the Hindi Bill, of paramount importance to the country, is on the anvil, surely everything could have been managed in a better way. But I do not think these things are done in a proper fashion. That is why I do believe that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has a job of work which he does not take as seriously as he should.

16 hrs.

Take, for instance, the Consultative Committees which are there, which are no substitutes for the Standing Committees, which could perhaps be brought in. It is a bigger subject. But he does not apply his mind to these things.

I repeat that I have no animus against him. He knows that there is complete cordiality. Maybe sometimes the atmosphere in the House becomes a little difficult. We appear generally perhaps somewhat humourless because I have no doubt we function largely in a language which is not our own, a language in which we do not initiate our own thoughts. We are as good a club as the House of Commons ever has been in our own way, in a different way, no doubt. But we are as good a club as the House of Commons. Our personal relations will continue to be extremely cordial.

I only want to say one thing. I have noticed—I have also remarked to some friends who talked to me—that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is feeling rather nervous. He need not be nervous. He should be optimistic. And about optimism, I am reminded of a story. An Irishman fell into the water. He was drowning. There were people, his friends, watching

helplessly from the bank. But even as he was drowning, he waved to them and said: 'Don't worry, folks. There is land at the bottom'. That is the spirit in which I expect him to behave.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): I rise to praise the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and not to criticise or oppose him. Criticism is done if you want to condemn or you want to disable. I have no such desire and there is no such occasion. I do not feel called upon to oppose him because opposition becomes necessary only if there is non-accommodation from the other side. That is not the case here. Therefore, what better compliment could I pay to the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs than this that although as an occupant of Opposition Benches and, it is my desire to wound, I have no heart to strike.

I have watched the performance of the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs on the floor of this House as well as in the deliberations of the Business Advisory Committee, and at both places, he is as efficient as he is amiable; particularly in the Committee proceedings he displays himself as sartorially correct and as Byronically elegant as he is crisp and businesslike on the floor of this House. In Committee work, he likes to cap his remarks with poetical observations, and although sometimes apocryphal, it cannot be said that they are always beside the point.

Coming to the Report of his Department, it shows that the hon. Minister is capable of combining efficiency with economy. Instead of yielding to the general failing of becoming more and more expensive to the taxpayers, he actually shows a small saving of, I think, a few thousand rupees. A cursory glance at this Report shows that he has done a good job of work during the year under review.

[Shri Kapur Singh]

Having said this, I should like to add that the true import of this Report has not in what it says but in what it fails to say. Our erstwhile brothers, the Chinese, have a saying that the deepest truth lies where the word is not spoken. We also have a metaphysical tradition which asserts that our comprehension of reality is the subtlest and nearest to truth when we comprehend the unstruck sound—*anhad shabd*, as they call it.

The report before us says nothing about the Government-and-the-Press of the country. It is so because ours is a democratic country. It is rightly so because we in this country have a press which is completely free. It is a Press which takes no orders from anybody, from any quarter, much less from the Government. Our Prime Minister, however, has recently made some observations on the Press of our country which I should like to quote, with your permission. At the closing session of the Seminar on the Indian Press organised by the Press Institute of India and the India International Centre, he said:

"How a small group represents freedom of the Press! Although it may not be interfered with by the Government, surely the power of money itself is a very important element which interferes with the freedom. Big industries owning newspapers may or may not interfere with them. But the fact of big industry by itself owning newspapers or chains of newspapers cannot be said to give them the kind of freedom which an independent editor has".

Be that as it may, I have nothing but the highest praise for the free Press of our country, despite the increasing whispers which sometimes one hears about certain romantic happenings. Mrs. Grundy often asserts, and all of us know, that there exists some kind of a matrimonial alliance between the press of our country and the Govern-

ment of our country. Being free, this matrimonial alliance is in keeping with the ancient traditions of our country, that of Gandharva marriage. Our ancient texts of Kamsutra tell us that this kind of alliance takes place without anybody being a witness to it except the full moon. This kind of alliance is supposed to exist between the Press of this country and the Government of this country.

Mr. Speaker: And the full moon is the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs?

Mr. Kapur Singh: No, Sir. I am coming to what the status of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is in this alliance. Full moon, as an ancient Rigveda text says चन्द्र मनसो जातः full moon represents completely that of which there is no objective witness. Full moon represents that area of the human mind where reason and rationality and principles do not enter but emotions and sentiments are the determining factors.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Because it gives rise to tides in the ocean.

Shri Kapur Singh: It gives rise to tides in the ocean, also in the human heart. And it is to this latter tide that I am coming, what type of tide it might give rise to, what type of tide it ought to give rise to, and what the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs ought to do about it. This matrimonial alliance, it is being said....

Shri Tyagi: Matrimonial alliance?

Shri Kapur Singh: Gandharva marriage.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Tyagi feels interested in matrimonial matters.

Shri Kapur Singh: I very much understand his interest and I sympathise with him.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is too late.

Shri Kapur Singh: It is never too late; it is a good thing for Shri Tyagi.

It is further being said, Mrs. Grundy says it, that this matrimonial alliance is being kept in good trim by the age-old methods of whispers of love, of communications of silly-nothings through telephonic conversations. It is further being maintained in good shape through frequent grants of gifts. Government advertisements are being mentioned in this connection. I personally know nothing about this, but I merely wish to say that this being the position, it is here that the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs comes in. I expect him to exercise his powers, his undoubted influence as the male partner of this marriage, to see that his better half, the lady, pays a little more attention, confers some little more favours, on the poor country cousins of the Treasury Benches who are the Members sitting on Opposition benches.

In the hope that my suggestion will be accepted by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, I beg to close with a prayer for his long life and prosperity, by saying:

“ तुम सलामत रहो हजार बरस,
हर बरस के हों दिन पचास हजार ।”

श्री बड़े (खारगोन) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मिनिस्टरी आफ पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स की बजट डिमांड्स इस हाउस में प्रथम बार आई है। बिजनेस ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी का मेम्बर होने के नाते मैं कह सकता हूँ कि हमारे मिनिस्टर आफ पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स का हृदय नारियल के समान ऊपर से तो कठोर है लेकिन अंदर से वह नरम और मोठा है। हम देखते हैं कि शुरू शुरू में तो वे नहीं, नहीं कहते हैं लेकिन बाद में वे हाँ, हाँ, कहने लगते हैं। इसलिये जैसा मैंने कहा उनका हृदय ऊपर से तो नारियल के समान कठोर है लेकिन अंदर से वह नरम है और मोठा भी है।

जहाँ तक हाउस के समाने बिजनेस लाने का सवाल है मुझे यह कहते हुए दुःख होता है कि वह प्रीपरली प्लान्ड नहीं किया जाता है और हम देखते हैं कि जब किसी विधेयक अथवा विषय के लिए ज्यादा समय अपेक्षित होता है तो उसका पहले से अरेंजमेंट होता नहीं है, समय उस के लिये प्रोवाइड नहीं हो पाता है और कह दिया जाता है कि इतना वर्क है और यह सब इस अवधि के भीतर पूरा करना है। हमारे पास और समय नहीं है और ऐसा कह कर जल्दी की जाती है और लेजिस्लेशन को रश अफ किया जाता है और उन पर ठीक से विचार नहीं हो पाता है। उनकी ओर से कह दिया जाता है कि भाई लाचारी है हमारे पास समय नहीं है और इसे पास करना है। मेरा कहना यह है कि बिजनेस को हाउस में रखने से पहले प्रीपर प्लानिंग नहीं की जाती है। परिणाम यह होता है कि अपोजीशन पार्टीज को थोड़ा समय मिलता है। कांग्रेस के मुकाबले हमारी संख्या थोड़ी होने के कारण एक हमारा बोलता है, तो तीन कांग्रेस के मੈम्बर्स बुलाने होते हैं। इस के कारण कभी कभी बहुत थोड़ा तीन, चार मिनट का समय मिलता है और वह भी मुश्किल से मिलता है। मिनिस्टर आफ पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स के पास इसका कोई नकशा नहीं रहता है कि वर्क कितना है और किस प्रकार से वह डिवाइड होना चाहिये। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि आज जो हाउस में कभी कभी किसी बिजनेस के लिए समय नहीं मिल पाता है वह चीज ठीक होनी चाहिए और इस के लिए प्रीपर प्लानिंग उनको तरफ से की जानी चाहिए।

दूसरी चीज मुझे यह निवेदन करनी है कि जब मैं मेज पार्लियामेंटरी प्रैक्टिस की किताब को पढ़ता हूँ तो पाता हूँ कि पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी के चेअरमैन वहाँ हमेशा अपोजीशन पार्टीज से होते रहे हैं। मैं चाहूँगा कि उस प्रैक्टिस को यहाँ भी

[श्री बड़े]

चलाया जाय और अपोजीशन के जो अलग अलग दो या तीन ग्रुप्स होते हैं उन अपोजीशन ग्रुप्स में से किसी को पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी का चेअरमैन बनाया जाय। उचित यह है कि पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटीज में अपोजीशन का ज्यादा से ज्यादा सहयोग लिया जाय। बिज़नेस ज़रूर हम अपोजीशन वालों से बिज़नेस के बारे में विचार विनिमय करते हैं लेकिन मेरा कहना है कि केवल इतना ही पर्याप्त नहीं है। उन्होंने कभी भी हम अपोजीशन वालों के पास आकर इस बारे में विचार विनिमय नहीं किया कि क्या आने वाला और क्या न आने वाला है या जो बिल आने वाला है उस पर आपका क्या दृष्टिकोण रहेगा? मेरा तो कहना है कि हाउस में जो कभी कभी एक हंगामा हो जाता है उस का कारण केवल यही है कि मिनिस्टर साहब कभी भी अपोजीशन वालों से हाउस में चलने वाले बिज़नेस के बारे में विचार विनिमय नहीं करते हैं और यह जानने की परवाह नहीं करते कि उनका उस सम्बन्ध में क्या दृष्टिकोण रहेगा ?

मैं भी अन्य सदस्यों की आवाज़ में अपनी आवाज़ मिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक उनके व्यक्तित्व का सम्बन्ध है वह बड़ा आकर्षक है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की वह पूरी कौपी है। उसी तरह का उनका अच्छा और आकर्षक पहनावा होता है, शेरवानी में उसी तरह फूल वे भी लगाते हैं जैसे कि प्रधान मंत्री महोदय लगाते हैं और उनको देख कर ही मन खुश हो जाता है। जहाँ तक काम का सम्बन्ध है काम भी ख़ाता अच्छा चल रहा है लेकिन दरअसल सब कुछ अच्छा, अच्छा कहने से काम नहीं चलने वाला है और इसलिए हम अपोजीशन वालों की जो डिफिकल्टीज हैं वह मैं आप की माफ़त मिनिस्टर साहब के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। हमारी मुख्य रूप से तीन डिफिकल्टीज हैं।

पहली तो है हमारी फंसिलिटीज हूँ अथवा हमारे राइट्स के बाबत। चूँकि उधर ब्रूट मेज़ारिटी है या क्रीशिंग मेज़ारिटी है इस कारण हमारे राइट्स और फंसिलिटीज की परवाह नहीं की जाती है और राइट्स को कभी कभी कुचला भी जाता है। दूसरे हम अपोजीशन वालों को अपने विचार भली प्रकार प्रकट कर सकने के लिये काफी समय मिलना चाहिए जो कि अभी नहीं मिलता है। तीसरे यह कि हम अपोजीशन वालों से मिनिस्टर आफ पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स बिज़नेस या अन्य सम्बन्धित विषयों पर विचार विनिमय किया करें जो कि अभी नहीं करते हैं। अगर यह तीनों बातें करेंगे तो जिस तरह से दूध में शक्कर डालने से वह स्वादिष्ट और मीठा हो जाता है, उसी तरह से यह विभाग भी हो जायगा। मुझे आशा है कि वे इन पर सहानुभूतिपूर्वक विचार करेंगे।

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):
Sir, the hon. Members who have preceded me have discussed the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs at three levels. In the first place, they have tried to throw compliments to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs in the most encouraging fashion. I join with them and say that our country is very lucky and our Parliament is very fortunate in having a Minister of Parliamentary Affairs who is not at all a controversial figure and who is a friend, guide and adviser not only to the Government, not only to the House, but also to the Opposition Parties. I will be failing in my duty if I do not say that our Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has done a wonderful job of his very very difficult work. I wish Mr. Feroze Gandhi were alive today to say all those things which he used to tell about the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. I do not want to discuss the perfumes or their qualities but I must say of him that he is a gentleman very rare in this world of today; he has absolutely

no rancour and no malice and he makes friends with everyone very easily. If any Opposition Member says that he is not consulted, I do not think that he is duty-bound to consult every Opposition Member. Sometimes I feel jealous of those Members when he goes and sits with them for such a long time; he never comes to the Congress Benches and sits with us. He even sits with Mr. Kamath who made a name as a dissenter and who will try to go against any establishment that we have.

The kind of things that some of my friends expect from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs are not to be had from any human being in this world, however excited he may be. For instance, it is said that he should be like a drill sergeant who should ensure Members' attendance at all times of the day and night. I do not think that anybody can do it. I do not think that this is done in any Parliament in the world. I think it is in our Parliament that we have a statutory attendance register. I do not think that this is done anywhere else, in any democracy. I do not think that any human being, unless it be Hitler, would be able to ensure attendance of the Members of Parliament at all times of the day and night. If a man thinks like that, I think that he feels that the Members of Parliament are worse than kindergarten children. This is something which cannot be expected from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

There are some friends of mine who make use of adjectives which are sometimes very self contradictory. They specialise in that. They say he has consistently failed to arrange the business of the House. If the arrangement of business of the House is an example of failure, I do not understand what we mean by the successful functioning of this House. Everybody knows how much time is allotted. You distribute the time between the Opposition and the Congress Benches. You guide and advise us.

Somebody was talking about matrimonial alliance and Gandharava marriage. So far as the conducting of the business of the House is concerned, because of the happy marriage between the Lok Sabha Secretariat, the Speaker and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Speaker need not be brought into this alliance.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Things which we have not been able to do have been foisted upon the head of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. For instance, we have not been able to arrive at any decision so far as the formation of a committee for public undertakings is concerned. My hon. friend who talked like that thinks they are living under an authoritarian Government. In fact, their whole view of life is authoritarian and if sometimes they have a democratic head over the authoritarian shoulders they cannot get away from the authoritarian philosophy of life which they have imbibed all these years. I think that to say that it has not been done is a slur upon democracy. Democracy, as you know, functions slowly but surely, and authoritarianism, as you know, functions quickly but disastrously. I think if we have taken a little more time than necessary for the formation of this committee on public undertaking, it is a tribute to democracy. It shows that we want to have something by which our functioning could be made very smooth.

It has been said that the Parliamentary Committees have not been working very well. I think I would be failing in my duty if I do not say that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, during his tenure of office, has made the functioning of parliamentary business in this House a model for the other democracies to follow. I believe in some matters we have gone even further than the House of Commons which claims to have had a democratic functioning over several centuries. We have gone further than

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

that. I ask my hon. friends whether the assurances that are given by the Ministers are not taken note of. I think no democracy in the world takes those assurances so seriously as the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, and I am glad to say that 97 per cent of those assurances are fulfilled.

Shri M. L. Dwivedi (Hamirpur): 99 per cent.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I think that is a great tribute to the tact and shrewdness of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Again, I find that there he has been able to give the private Member some kind of dignity, some kind of prestige, which was not to be found in the good old days. Where was the private Member then? The whole thing was Government-sponsored, and all the time was taken by the Government Bills and other things. Now, we find we have private Member's Resolutions, private Members' Bills, etc. The House of Commons appointed a committee on procedural reforms of the House of Commons and they came to the conclusion that 60 per cent of the time should be taken by the Government and 40 per cent should be given to the private Members. I find that so far as that point is concerned we have done much better, without appointing such a committee. I think that the Government takes only 40 per cent and the rest of the time is given to the private Members' Bills and Resolutions. I do not think any other democracy in the world has got what you were pleased to call a No-Day-Yet-Named-Motion, half-hour discussion, etc. All these things show how well the rights of the private Members are being respected. I think for that the credit goes to our Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

But he has one disability and disadvantage. There are some persons who try to throw their weight about even when they have only a little office to bear. There are other per-

sons who bear their office very lightly and do not let anybody feel that they are mighty and great and proud. The difficulty with him is this: he tries to be a friend among friends and an equal among equals, and a co-partner among partners and a democrat among democrats. Therefore, we do not find that kind of attitude about him which will inspire awe or which will create trouble or which will create or give an impression or a sense of authority.

In the end, I want to say that a Minister of Parliamentary Affairs like the one we have is a blessing. I feel that as time goes on, the private Member in this House will have a better time in this House than he has in any other democracy in the world. Also, he will try to see that the Government does not monopolise as much of authority and prestige and power as against a private Member. The private Member has a special reason to thank the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

I do not want to go into details of everything. Only one more point I want to make and it is this.

What is the budget of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs? I think even the amount spent on stationery by some Ministries is higher than the entire budget of the Department of Parliamentary Affairs. I would like that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs could have a bigger budget to deal with, so that he could be of greater service to the Private Members. Government can look after itself.

He has been a great friend of everyone of us. It is not a question of a Congress Member, a PSP Member or a Member of any other party. He is a gentleman who inspires love and confidence and respect. I know there are certain persons who will find fault even with the sun and the moon and with everything. It is not for me to do so.

In the end, I would like to say that we are very lucky in having a genial, shrewd and kind-hearted person like him as Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. He is efficient, his is the efficiency of the gentleman and not the efficiency of a soldier or drill sergeant.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री कामत ।

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री कपूर सिंह और बड़े साहब दोनों मेरे सरपरस्त हैं। उन्होंने बहुत थोड़ा टाइम लिया है। इस लिए उन का वचा हुआ टाइम मुझे मिलना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त नहीं। श्री कामत ।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : आप ने इस डिस्कशन का टाइम भी बढ़ा दिया है। हम साल भर इस आशा में बैठे रहे हैं कि आज के दिन हम को दो मिनट मिलेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : साल भर मिनस्ट्रो आफ् पार्लियामेंटरो एफ़ेयर्ज पर बोलने के लिए बैठे रहे ?

श्री यशपाल सिंह : जी हाँ, आज मुझे दो मिनट दे दिये जायें। बाद में चाहे मेरे पांच मिनट काट लिये जायें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री कामत ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I sat listening to my hon. friend, Shri Hiren Mukerjee, and heard him through, I was rather disappointed, because I missed something which we always have in his speeches. While not even his best friends would accuse him of any capacity to shake empires or move amendments, I have always associated with him an outstanding ability to recite Sanskrit slokas with a perfect Oxford English accent. I am sorry in this particular speech I could not hear even one Sanskrit line with an impeccable Oxford English accent.

Mr. Speaker: He was all along saying that Mr. Kamath would do that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I do not do that. He said something else about me, but I had associated this quality with him. But I missed that in his speech today.

Today is the first anniversary of the commencement of this Lok Sabha. It met on the 16th April last year and today it is exactly one year. It is a historic day, as you said earlier, because in the history of Parliament, even assuming what is laid about Provisional Parliament is correct, since 1952, this is the first time that my hon. friend's demands have come up for discussion in this House. He has had a chequered career inside the House.

Shri A. P. Jain (Tumkur): A picturesque career.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He started as a whip, I suppose, in his early days in the late thirties of this century. Now, through the years he has elevated himself or rather has been elevated to the Cabinet rank.

Mr. Speaker: The demands are for this reason, for what he has done?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Without this background, how can you appreciate it? I am sure this would help everyone to appreciate it. He is a unique Minister in some respects. He is a Minister without a Ministry. This is called a department. Still, the most outstanding achievement of the Minister is delineated in the last para of this report:

There it is said:

"The Department is in charge of a Minister of Cabinet rank designated as Minister for Parliamentary Affairs."

This is a very interesting piece of information. I do not know why

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

this report contains this information. Then it says:

"He is also the Government Chief Whip and is assisted by three Government Deputy Chief whips....."

Not one or two, but three Deputy Chief Whips—because he has not even a Parliamentary Secretary he must have three Deputy Chief Whips. It is said:

"...two in the Lok Sabha and one in the Rajya Sabha as also by a number of regional Whips."

"Reginal" means I suppose "all over the country". He must be having many Whips all over the country. But with these Whips at his command, I was rather surprised—you too, Sir, have remarked this pretty often—that with these three Deputy Chief Whips at his command and himself to head them all or to top the list he has not been able to maintain the quorum in the House even when voting had to take place. I hope he will look to this and perform this duty more efficiently in future.

Now, Sir, I come to the subject of the cut motion. The cut motion relates to the need for more efficient planning of government legislative and other business for the sessions of the Lok Sabha. It has been our painful experience almost every session, of this Third Lok Sabha anyway, that what is listed in the First Bulletin of the Session is never implemented even substantially. I do not know why this should be so. I could understand that in the earlier years, before he elevated himself as a Cabinet Minister or he became a Cabinet Minister, because there is still snobbery in this world, in the official world and in the ministerial world, as a Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs he could not expect, extort or exact the same co-operation from his colleagues, the

Cabinet Ministers as he can and must now. He is a Cabinet Minister since April, 1962, and I am sure his Cabinet colleagues will co-operate with him more wholeheartedly and more vigorously than they used to when he was a mere Minister of State for Parliamentary Affairs. I hope, Sir, that before a session starts, that is to say, during the inter-session period, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs must exert himself and he must devote more time and attention to parliamentary affairs and less to other affairs.

An Hon. Member: Please specify.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Therefore, during this inter-session period he must ask every Ministry to supply to him the Bills that they would like to introduce and put through in the coming session. I would request him, and I am sure the whole House would back him in this respect, to tell the Ministries and the Ministers categorically, even the Minister for External Affairs, that unless and until a Bill is introduced in the first week of a short session and in the first fortnight of a long session no attempt to squeeze the Bills through during the last fortnight or last week, thereby stultifying this House, thereby throttling discussion, thereby hustling important Bills, would be countenanced. If this is enforced vigorously and strictly and every Ministry and Minister is told that this should be done and unless this is done we will see to it that the Bills will not be permitted to be introduced at a later date during the session—of course, there may be exceptions and those exceptions apart this should be a general rule—then better results can be achieved. I will give you one instance. There was the Official Languages Bill over which there was, unfortunately, such a furore in the House. This Bill was not mentioned in the President's Address.

Mr. Speaker: If he will excuse my interruption—the reply would be

given by the hon. Minister—I can assure him that the Minister is proceeding exactly on the lines that the hon. Member has suggested. Yesterday I had the chance of seeing the correspondence that he has been carrying on with the ministers. He showed me those things. He has been doing what the hon. Member has suggested.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am glad he is doing it. But I do not see that he was doing that. The results are not apparent to the House. That is why I have to draw his attention to it. The Official Languages Bill was not mentioned in the President's Address nor in the First Bulletin of the Session of 18th February. Yet, suddenly it has been smuggled in and it has been brought before the House. I do not know why it has been done so. What was the hurry, if I may use the words the inordinate, unconscionable and indecent haste, to bring this in—I am not against the Bill, but that is a different matter—when it is not mentioned in the President's Address, nor in the bulletin? What was the point in introducing it in this session, at the fag end of the session?

There is another aspect of the matter. There are three kinds of business before the House—legislative business, financial business and other business, apart from the two and a half hours, that are regularly set up every Friday for non-official business. Now, I do not know the proportion, proportion in point of time, *inter se* between these three kinds of business—legislative business, financial business and other business. I hope that there will be a more equitable distribution of time between these three kinds of business before the House. It is imperative that in a parliamentary democracy the non-official members of the House should get more time to discuss matters relating to the people, matter of public importance. Therefore, more opportunities should be given for non-

official motions to be moved in the House, i.e., subject coming under the third category of "other business", and I hope the proportion of time will be roughly 33-1/3 per cent for each.

There are one or two other points I would like to refer to briefly before I close.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should now conclude.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir you will appreciate that I have taken more interest in this matter than others.

Mr. Speaker: Certainly, he has.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On the question of planning the business of the House, as I said on an earlier occasion, I do not blame the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs alone—it is more applicable to his Cabinet colleagues—for the bad planning, chaotic planning, unsystematic planning, inefficient planning of Government business. His activities behind the *purdah*, so to say, behind the scenes, and he comes here every Friday to make a statement on Government business. He is more or less behind the *purdah*, behind the scene, and his colleagues in the Cabinet alone are responsible for this state of affairs. All the same, he has to face the odium of the House, because he is the Minister responsible for this subject and also because, perhaps, he does not enforce, does not compel the Ministers strictly, vigorously to see to it that no Bill introduced late in a session shall be put through and Bills introduced in the earlier session will be put through in that particular session.

One last word and I have done. To end this bad planning, this chaotic planning, the Ministries, the amiable Minister as he is and honourable too, he will have to learn to put his foot

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

down firmly on the Minister, his Cabinet colleagues—now he is not a mere Minister of State; he is a Cabinet Minister. He has now to learn to put his foot down firmly when the Ministers do not comply with his request regarding introduction of legislation.

Before I conclude, I am sorry, I have to refer to one little subject, another aspect of the matter of his duties with which he is not concerned, he should not be concerned, but, unfortunately, he put his feet into it, which he should not have done. I do not know whether he gave his explanation to the House subsequently. As this was mentioned in the House too, Sir, I would crave your indulgence to read just half a dozen lines from the proceedings of 24th January 1963, this year. With all respect, I would submit that he went out of his normal duties to indulge in this kind of activity which he ought not to have done. I did not expect him to do it. My hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony referred to it in the open House too and remarked thus:

"We seek information—I would like a denial of it—it seems the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs met the representatives of the Press and made a specific request, almost a direction, that they should play down, if not black out, all critical speeches from this side of the House."

That is, from the Opposition side of the House.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: The hon. Member must know that it was contradicted.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There is nothing in the proceedings to show that.

Mr. Speaker: If he has contradicted it, why then refer to it?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is not in the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: He should conclude now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Before I conclude, Sir, I am happy that he has made a refutation of this unfortunate charge against him. I hope, he will not do it again.

I hope, in the coming years he will secure the willing and whole-hearted co-operation of all his Cabinet colleagues and be able thereby to plan the business of this House in a more efficient, systematic and methodical manner in the interest not merely of the Government but of the Opposition, of Parliament as a whole and the people of this country.

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पार्लियामेंट्री अफेयर्स मिनस्ट्री की मांगों के ऊपर अभी हमारे कुछ विरोधी दल के सदस्यों ने विचार प्रकट किये। श्री ही० ना० मुकर्जी ने तो यह कहा कि बजट के समय पर राज्य सभा में विवाद पहले हुआ और लोक-सभा में बाद में हुआ, और इस के लिए उन्होंने दोषों ठहराया संसदीय कार्य मंत्री को। श्री ही० ना० मुकर्जी की जानकारी के लिये मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ, अगर वे जानते न हों, कि पार्लियामेंट्री अफेयर्स के जो मंत्री हैं वे कभी कभी विवश हो जाते हैं क्योंकि जो राज्य सभा और लोक-सभा के सचिवालय हैं वे भी माननीय सदस्यों के साथ वायर पुलिंग का काम करते हैं और सदस्य लोग उस के शिकार बन जाते हैं। उन्हें इस बात की शिकायत नहीं होती पर वे सहा वस्तुस्थिति को जान बैर ऐसी बातों में पड़ जाते हैं। इसलिये बेहतर हो कि अपनी समस्याओं को समझ कर इस पर विचार करें, और यह सावधानी की बात होगी। फिर आप देखेंगे कि संसदीय कार्य मंत्री का दोष इतना नहीं था। जैसा आप चाहते थे वैसा ही होता, क्योंकि मुझे इस विषय में पता है। मैं देख रहा हूँ कि राज्य सभा और लोक सभा के झगड़े चल रहे हैं, सचिवालयों

के झगड़े चल रहे हैं जिस से संसदीय कार्य में भी बड़ी कठिनाइयाँ उत्पन्न हो गई हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में कोई ऐसा कार्य हमारे संसदीय कार्य मंत्रों को करना चाहिये जिस से कि यह सचिवालयों के झगड़े समाप्त हों और दोनों सदनों के सदस्य एक हों, इस झगड़े को बन्द करें।

मैं इस सम्बन्ध में अधिक नहीं कहना चाहता लेकिन यह आश्चर्य की बात है कि एक सदन का कार्रवाई दूसरे सदन के सदस्यों को नहीं मिलता, चाहे लोक सभा हो चाहे राज्य सभा हो। उस सदन के सदस्य यह कहते हैं कि यहाँ के सचिवालय के कारण नहीं मिलता और हम लोगों का यह शिकायत है कि वहाँ के कारण नहीं मिलता। कुछ भी हो, दोनों सदनों के सदस्यों को इस का जानकारी रखना चाहिये, और यह कार्य संसदीय कार्य मंत्रों कर सकते हैं। क्योंकि पता नहीं कि हमारे अध्यक्ष महोदय का बात वहाँ चलता है या नहीं, फिर भी यदि राज्य सभा के चेयरमैन और लोक सभा के अध्यक्ष दोनों मिले और संसदीय कार्य मंत्रों इस में सहयोग दें तो यह कार्य सम्भव हो सकता है।

जहाँ तक कोरम का प्रश्न है, संसदीय कार्य मंत्रों इस कोरम को पूरा करने का चेष्टा करते हैं, लेकिन कभी विरोधी दल के सदस्यों ने भी यह सोचा कि उनका भी कर्तव्य है कि वह कोरम बनायें। मैंने यहाँ देखा है कि विरोधी सदस्य भाषण कर के भाग जाते हैं, उत्तर देने के समय यहाँ मौजूद नहीं रहते हैं।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : सब नहीं भाग जाते।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं बहुत से सदस्यों को बतला दूंगा। हाँ आप का बात नहीं कह रहा हूँ, आप तो रहते हैं। लेकिन कुछ ऐसे सदस्य हैं जो ऐसा करते हैं।

श्री कामत ने भी कोरम के प्रश्न को उठाया। उन्होंने यह समझा कि कोरम बनाने का कार्य केवल संसदीय कार्य मंत्रों का है

और कांग्रेस दल का ही है, लेकिन कभी क्या उन्होंने यह भी सोचा कि संसदीय कार्य मंत्रों को विनम्रता से और उनको मेहरबानी से विरोधी दलों के सदस्यों को, जो कि एक तिहाई से भी कम हैं, प्राचे समय से अधिक मिला जाता है। जो ३७० सदस्य यहाँ बैठे रहते हैं उन को प्राचे समय से भी कम समय मिलता है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : विरोध करने वालों का यह अधिकार है, हम लोग बराबर चुन कर प्राये हैं।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : विरोध करने वालों का उतना अधिकार कैसे हो सकता है? हम लोग भी उसी तरह चुन कर प्राये हैं। इस लिये कांग्रेस दल के विरोधी दलों के बराबर अधिकार हैं, यह मैं नहीं मान सकता।
(Interruptions.)

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): There cannot be any conversation.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): The word 'meharbani' should be expunged.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर। माननीय सदस्य यह नहीं जानते हैं कि समय देने का काम उन का नहीं है। यह उन को तय नहीं करना है कि अपोजिशन को कितना समय दिया जाय। इस प्रकार से वे मुझ पर रिफ्लेक्शन कर रहे हैं। यह संसदीय कार्य मंत्रों का काम नहीं है।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं मानता हूँ कि यह आप का काम है। मैंने संसदीय-कार्य मंत्रों का नाम लिया यह गलत है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप सारा कांग्रेस को कह सकते हैं कि उस ने मंजूर किया, लेकिन आप इस बात को न लीजिये।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : अच्छा बात है।

अब मैं इस बात का और सदन का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय ने वास्तव में काम तारोफ का

[श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी]

किया है। भले ही कुछ सदस्यों को इस में तारीफ न दिखाई देती हो लेकिन मैं उन सदस्यों में से हूँ जो आलोचना करने से चूकते नहीं। जब कभी किसी मंत्रालय में मुझे दोष दिखाई देते हैं तो मैं उन्हें यहाँ रखता हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारा कर्तव्य है कि यहाँ जनहित का प्रतिनिधित्व करें और सरकार को उन बातों की नुक्ताचोनी करें जिन से सुधा रहो सकता है। इसलिये मैं इसमें कभी नहीं चूकता। लेकिन यदि मंत्रालय काम श्रद्धा करता है तो उसकी तारीफ करना भी हमारा कर्तव्य है, और इस लिये मैं मंत्रालय को तारीफ भी करता हूँ। फिर यह काम मैंने ही नहीं किया। यह "स्टेट्समैन" अखबार मेरे सामने है, जिसका एडिटोरियल माननीय सदस्यों ने पढ़ा होगा। उसमें लिखा है :

"Statistically, the apportionment of Parliament's time among several kinds of business last year seems ideal."

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : इसका हिन्दी तर्जुमा कर दाँजिये।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : कहने का मतलब यह है कि आदर्श काम इस मंत्रालय का है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो साहब आप से पूछ रहे हैं वह अंग्रेजी समझते हैं। इसलिये आप आगे चलिये।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : अब मैं दूसरी बात को तरफ आता हूँ। मेरे पास एक किताब है जिसका नाम है "फंक्शन आफ पार्लियामेंटरी व्हिप्स"। यह गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया के डिपार्टमेंट आफ पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स ने जारी की थी। इसमें डब्ल्यू० एच० मारिस जोन्स का एक कोटेशन देखने को मिला है जिसमें लिखा है :

"In India this has been achieved."

यहाँ के पार्लियामेंटरी काम में संसदीय सदस्यों को जो सुविधायें मिलती हैं उनके संबंध में लिखा है कि जो सुविधायें ब्रिटिश पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों को नहीं मिलतीं वह यहाँ मिली हैं।

"The new Parliament has perhaps been fortunate in its first Government Chief Whip. Mr. Satya Narayan Sinha brings to his task a rich political experience. As a party member, he was President of a District Congress Committee for 17 years...."

"...Qualifications of personality are more important and it appears to be generally agreed that he is both shrewd and persuasive, both purposeful and humorous; it has been said that while every conversation with him hides a negotiation, at the same time every negotiation becomes a conversation."

ये ट्रिव्यूट्स एक विलायत के आदमी ने हमारे पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स मंत्री के प्रति व्यक्त किये गये, और मैं उनसे सहमत हूँ।

माननीय मंत्रालय ने इस प्रतिवेदन में भी देखा होगा कि इस मंत्रालय का साल भर का बजट केवल ३ लाख, १७ हजार ६० का है। दूसरे शब्दों में अगर मैं कहूँ तो यह है कि यदि राज्य सभा और लोक सभा के साल भर के बजट में से आठ दिनों के खर्च को देखा जाय तो उस आठ दिनों के खर्च में यह पूरा मंत्रालय साल भर काम चलाता है।

डा० लक्ष्मीमल्ल सिधवी : इस तुलना से आप का क्या अभिप्राय है ?

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : मैं तुलना नहीं कर रहा हूँ। इसके साथ साथ संकट काल की परिस्थिति के उत्पन्न होने पर इस मंत्रालय ने बचत भी दिखाई है और वह बचत अनुकरणीय है, इस माने में कि दूसरे विभागों ने वैसी बचत नहीं दिखाई। मैंने देखा है कि

दूसरे मंत्रालयों में ऐसे कर्मचारी और अधिकाारी अब भी मौजूद हैं जिन के पास काम नहीं है, लेकिन उन को छंटनी नहीं की गई और न दूसरे काम में उन्हें लगाया गया। हमारे बित्त मंत्री महोदय हमें आश्वासन देते रहे कि यह काम जारी है, यह किया जा रहा है; हो सकता है कि सही स्थिति का पता हमें इस संबंध में बाद में चले।

मैं सदन के सदस्यों का ध्यान इस ओर भी आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ इस मंत्रालय के बजट में इतना कम व्यय होता वहाँ उसका काम बहुत बढ़ गया है। उदाहरण के लिये सन् १९५४ में उसके द्वारा १ हजार पत्र जारी हुये थे जबकि विगत वर्ष में ५२ हजार ५६१ पत्र जारी हुये। कहने का अर्थ यह है कि यदि कोई काम करता है तो उसके बारे में भी हमें देखना चाहिये, आखिरी मोर्चा कर नहीं बैठे रहना चाहिये।

जैसा कि शर्मा जी ने बतलाया, जो एम्प्लॉयमेंट दिये गये उनका ६६ प्रतिशत पूरा किया गया है। साथ ही साथ नान-आफिशियल बिजनेस भी बढ़ाया गया है। लेकिन इस संबंध में मुझे अन्तर्गत है इस माना में कि जो नो डे यट नेम्ड मोशन होते हैं वे किसी न किसी सरकारों रिपोर्ट पर बहस करने के लिये होते हैं। इसलिये यह एक तरह से सरकारों का काम है। इस समय को नान-आफिशियल बिजनेस में नहीं गिनना चाहिये। मेरा सुझाव है कि प्राइवेट मेम्बर्स बिजनेस के लिये सदन को अधिक समय दिया जाये। यह सन्तोषजनक है कि सरकार ३५ परसेंट समय देती है लेकिन मुझे विश्वास है कि इससे अधिक समय आयन्दा मिलेगा।

मैं अच्छे काम के लिये मंत्रा महोदय को बधाई देता हूँ और कैबिनेट से और प्रधान मंत्रा जी से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि यदि एक अनुभव-शाल मंत्रा है जो कि स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के बाद से बराबर काम कर रहा है और जिसे कैबिनेट का रोक दिया गया है, उसे कुछ और काम

सुपुर्द किया जाये और कुछ और विभाग दिये जायें जिससे काम में और भी बढ़ोतरी हो और जो कैबिनेट के अन्य सदस्य हैं वे भी उनको अधिक सहयोग दें।

मंत्रालय के अच्छे काम के लिये मैं इस मंत्रालय के सचिवालय को भी बधाई दूंगा, जिन्होंने अपना पूरा सहयोग दिया और पूरी निष्ठा से काम किया और इस काम को पूरा करने में ईमानदारी और दयानतदारी बरती।

मैं पुनः अपने मंत्रा महोदय को और उनके सचिवालय को बधाई देता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि भविष्य में वे संसद सदस्यों से और अधिक सम्पर्क रखेंगे। और शेष सचिवालय इस सचिवालय से इस मामले में आदर्श ग्रहण करेंगे और जन सम्पर्क बढ़ायेंगे। कुछ सचिवालय जन सम्पर्क नहीं करते और छिपे बैठे रहते हैं। पर आजकल लोकतंत्र के युग में जन सम्पर्क अति आवश्यक है। तो मेरा सुझाव है कि अन्य सचिवालयों को भी इस सचिवालय की तरह जनता से और संसद सदस्यों से सम्पर्क रखना चाहिये। इस सचिवालय का जन सम्पर्क का काम, अद्वितीय है और अनुकरणीय है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस मंत्रालय को मांगों का समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री यशपाल सिंह: अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे भी दो मिनट का समय दिया जाए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: अब मैं मिनिस्टर साहब को बुलाना चाहता हूँ।

श्री यशपाल सिंह: मैं केवल दो मिनट का समय चाहता हूँ। वह इतनी बड़ी पार्टी है। मैं समझता हूँ कि मिनिस्टर साहब को भी मेरे बोलने पर ऐतराज न होगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आप ने बार-बार कहा है कि यह इतनी बड़ी पार्टी है। मैंने कब मना किया है कि आप न बोलें। मैं यहाँ किसी पार्टी के खिलाफ काम करने को नहीं बैठा हूँ।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : आप इजाजत नहीं देते तो मैं नहीं बोलूंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बोल लीजिए।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका बड़ा अभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे समय दिया। मैं इसलिए इस मंत्रालय पर बोलना चाहता था कि मैं यहाँ पर चिपक कर बैठता हूँ और एक मिनट के लिए भी गैरहाजिर रहना पसन्द नहीं करता।

मेरा पहला मुद्दाव तो यह है कि जो चीजें हम ने अंग्रेजों से ली हैं उनको बदल देना चाहिए। मिसाल के लिए यहाँ पर जो गैर-सरकारी रिजोल्यूशन पेश किया जाता है उस पर लिखा होता है कि—यह इन सभा का निश्चित मत है कि—और बाद में हम देखते हैं कि उस पर एक भी वोट नहीं मिलता। तो मेरा कहना है कि इस फ्रेज को बदल देना चाहिए।

इसके अलावा जो मैं सबसे बड़ी बात कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि मैं इस हाउस में खास तौर से इसलिए आया था कि मैं अपने मिनिस्टर फार पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स की मुखालफित करूँगा। लेकिन मैंने उनकी शालीनता को, उनकी निष्पक्षता को, उनके सौष्ठव और इखलाक को और उनके काम करने के तरीके को देखा तो मेरा इरादा बदल गया। वे १२ साल तक कांग्रेस के चीफ व्हिप रहे हैं और स पद पर रह कर उन्होंने अंग्रेजों से टक्कर ली और उनको गिराया। और मैं कह सकता हूँ उन्होंने पार्लियामेंट के काम को बड़ी निष्पक्षता के साथ किया है। मैं ये सब बातें किसी को खुश करने के लिए नहीं कहता। मैं ये बातें केवल इसलिये कहता हूँ कि मैं देखता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय निष्पक्षता से काम करते हैं और यहाँ किसी के साथ तरफदारी नहीं होती। उन्होंने १२ साल तक कांग्रेस के चीफ व्हिप का काम किया और अंग्रेजों से शेर की तरह टक्कर ली और उसको गिराया और आज

जिस शालीनता सफाई, तथा निष्पक्षता से काम कर रहे हैं उसका अंगर मैं जिक्र न करूँ तो मैं अपने फर्ज से गिर जाऊँगा। मुझे आपके आशीर्वाद से यह फब्द हासिल है कि मैं ने इस पार्लियामेंट को सबसे ज्यादा अटेंड किया है और मैं एक मिनट के लिए भी गैर-हाजिर नहीं रहा। और मैंने देखा है कि हमारे मिनिस्टर आफ पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स साहब ने किस ईमानदारी से काम किया है। हो सकता है कि अंगर उन्होंने दस विल पेश किए तो सब के लिए वक्त न दे सके हों। लेकिन इसमें उनकी कोई खता नहीं। उसके कई कारण हो जाते हैं। मेरे जैसे जिद्दी मेम्बर ज्यादा समय ले लेते हैं, कभी वाकआउट आदि के कारण वक्त निकल जाता है। कभी कुछ लोगों को हार्ट फेल हो जाने के कारण पार्लियामेंट बन्द हो जाती है और ६ घंटे का समय निकल जाता है। तो इसमें इनकी कोई खता नहीं है।

जो एडवाइजरी कमेटी है वह टाइम सैट करती है और स्पीकर साहब टाइम देते हैं। इसलिए मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारे पार्लियामेंटरी अफेयर्स के मिनिस्टर साहब ने जिस निष्पक्षता के साथ, जिस निर्भीकता के साथ, जिस सौष्ठव और इखलाक के साथ और जिस सच्चाई, ईमानदारी और दयानतदारी के साथ काम किया है उसके लिए वे मुबारकबाद के पात्र हैं। हमें फब्द है कि हमको ऐसा मिनिस्टर हासिल हुआ है। हम पूरी तरह से उनका सहयोग करेंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अपना कुछ असर श्री कामत पर भी डालें।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : यह असम्भव है।

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel really overwhelmed by the kind words which have been uttered by friends from all sections of the House. I really do not deserve those compliments which

have been showered on me. But I have been always conscious of one thing, that I have the affection and love of the Members of this House irrespective of party affiliations. You know love always warps judgment..

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha): In this case also it has happened.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: ...and therefore anything said in my favour or in favour of my department is due to that.

As some of my friends have remarked, we are making history today in this House by discussing this Department. This Department, as you know, came into existence 14 or 15 years ago. We have never discussed it properly. Once it was discussed obliquely, I must say, when considering the Supplementary Demands when I had not to reply, but the then Finance Minister replied on behalf of this Department. I have made enquiries from all Parliaments and whatever information I could gather goes to show that the counterpart of this Department is never discussed in any Parliament. It was not discussed, therefore, in this House also. We had practically a kind of convention like that. But this time some friends of mine, particularly Shri Kamath, insisted that we should have a discussion, and I readily agreed for two reasons. First, I thought that Members would have an opportunity to know the handicaps and difficulties under which my Department is working and they would have a better appreciation of the same. The other reason which prompted me to accept it gladly was that unless any Department or Ministry is discussed, perhaps no significance or importance is attached to it.

Mr. Speaker: A longer time should have been allotted to this.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I will have no grievance.

38 (A) LSD—8.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: More time next year.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Different standards are there in this country to judge and evaluate the functions and functionaries of this parliamentary institution. In this connection, you will pardon me if I say something which may appear to have some personal reference. But at the same time, it is an interesting thing. The House knows that I was appointed the Chief Whip of the Government in 1946 when the Interim Government was formed. Even knowledgeable people in this country did not attach any importance or significance to this assignment; because of the parliamentary institutions being very new, they thought that the Chief Whip's position is something like what I am going to tell you. Somebody asked one of the Secretaries—I do not like to name him—as to what is the Chief Whip's position vis-a-vis the other Ministers and officials. He said: 'The Chief Whip's position is something like that of a Joint Secretary here'.

Two years later I had an opportunity of going to the UK in a parliamentary delegation under the leadership of your illustrious predecessor, Shri Mavalankar. The present Secretary of the Lok Sabha was also in that delegation. Both of us went to the then Chief Whip, my counterpart in the Labour Government there, Mr. Whitley, a senior and respected man. We are all curious to know how the Chief Whip's organisation functions there, his importance and his position vis-a-vis other Ministers of the Government. The conversations which I had with him were later incorporated in a book which is available in the Library of Parliament.

17 hrs.

I remember when I put him that question direct about his importance politically and his position in the House, he said: "You people know

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

that No. 10, Downing Street is the official residence of the Prime Minister. India knows it very well, but perhaps the people do not know that No. 11, Downing Street is the official residence of the Chief Whip, and the other Ministers come after him"

Mr. Speaker: Is the case the same here?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: No, Sir, not official residence. All these things are in that book which has been published later.

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Deasi): His official residence is next to the Prime Minister's.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In this House his seat is next to the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker: We are not concerned with that.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: When I asked him about his importance in the House, he replied using a beautiful phrase which I still remember. Businessman as he was, he used business terms. He said: "You ask about my importance in the House. Whoever is a director in the company, whatever his share, I am the Managing Director of the House."

Shri A. P. Jain: It is a question of you scratch my back, and I scratch your back.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: You know what influence the Managing Director exercises in companies in spite of the amendments which have been made to the Companies Act.

So, three years after, when I was appointed Minister of State in 1949, some of my friends wanted to congratulate me, and I told them: "It is no matter for congratulation. I still think that my position as Chief Whip is superior to the position of Minister of State."

Mr. Whitley also told us—the Secretary of the Lok Sabha was also there: "My position is equivalent to any senior Cabinet Minister because only the senior Cabinet Ministers are called Right Honourable, and the Government Chief Whip is always called Rt. Hon." He said that the Prime Minister was not obliged to consult any colleague of his regarding the parliamentary appointments, but he must, he was bound to, consult the Chief Whip.

There is no semblance of these things so far as I am concerned here, but I do hope that as the years roll by and Parliament grows more and more roots, my successor will certainly enjoy that position which the Chief Whip enjoys in other Parliaments.

An Hon. Member: You will do it

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I might say that the position of Chief Whip is very important in the parliamentary system. Sometimes in the House of Commons they called him "Minister of Patronage", "proper channel", "power behind the Throne".

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: No throne here.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: As I said, nothing is applicable so far as the present incumbent here is concerned.

Really in the parliamentary system, either in the party or in the Government, he is described to be the fulcrum round which the Government or the party moves. If the fulcrum is broken, the party is broken. Moreover, the working of Parliament depends very much upon the sympathy and efficient working of the whip's organisation. There is no doubt about that. Whatever deficiencies and shortcomings were there in the working of Parliament, I plead guilty to them. I am entirely responsible for all the omissions and commis-

sions that there are. That is my job. I have now become a Cabinet Minister but I can tell my hon. friend Shri Kamath that I exercised the same influence with my hon. friends and colleagues here when I was not even a State Minister. I had the same kind of co-operation and love and affection that I now get from my colleagues. That I have become a Cabinet Minister has made absolutely no difference.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You have been the same scapegoat all the time.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Yes, all the time.

Mr. Kamath raised the point about quorum. The ringing of the quorum bell is not peculiar to this Parliament. In other Parliaments also these things happen, though in these places not as often as it does here. Fortunately or unfortunately, there are not many Kamaths there. The House knows that when an important Bill like the Government of India Bill was passed in the House of Commons, there were only 12 Members present.... (Inter-ruptions.)

An Hon. Member: Should we do like that

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You can amend the Constitution.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: This question of quorum was not raised there. In spite of all this, I say I take the responsibility.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You can amend the Constitution.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: We are trying to do that also to help you. I say that it is our responsibility. But the Opposition cannot say that they have no responsibility. They have also their responsibility, proportionately. It is not our business only to form the quorum and very often, let me tell him, that proportionately the Opposition has also been guilty in this respect.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is a base and baseless allegation.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I do not say that we have no responsibility.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You are more responsible.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: As a bigger partner, proportionately I also take that responsibility, three-fourths of that responsibility.

Then, there is something about our budget and other things, implementation of the assurances, planning, etc. Other friends have also referred to them. With your permission, I would like to say something about them. Government have been planning parliamentary business in such a way that there is not only a fair adjustment of time for legislative, financial and non-legislative matters but also that due accommodation is given to the Members to raise discussion on various important matters during Government's own quota of parliamentary time. Government are conscious of the fact that private Member's time consists of only 2½ hours in a week. There are obvious limitations in the utilisation of this time for which the procedure of balloting, etc. has been adopted. Private Members have only ten hours per month. For the year 1962, Government gave 43 hours out of its own quota of parliamentary time to private Members to raise various discussions through No-day Yet-Named Motions. In the year 1960, fourteen such motions were discussed. The number was repeated in 1961. Thirteen motions were discussed in 1962 in the Lok Sabha and 13 in the Rajya Sabha.

About the division of parliamentary time for legislative, financial and non-legislative business, the position is that in the year 1962, 36 per cent of Government's time was spent on legislative items; 29 per cent on financial matters which included discussion on Demands for Grants and 35 per cent on non-legislative mat-

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

ters. The Department has been following the practice of having proper balance between the various types of business so that opportunities to Members to bring their points of view to the notice of the Government are not confined to occasions for consideration of Bills of different Ministries, which naturally restrict the scope of discussion.

The time that we have devoted to discussion on non-legislative items has been steadily on the increase. In 1958 it was 28 per cent, in 1960, 31 per cent, in 1961, 31.5 per cent and in 1962, 35 per cent. The average of the time taken in the past few years on legislative, financial and non-legislative business makes up a division of time into three more or less equal parts. In this matter we have gone far ahead of any other Parliament, and it can be stated without fear of contradiction that far lesser opportunities of discussion on various items of governmental activity are available to Members of the House of Commons even.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: On points of order, how much time has been taken?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I do not know. The Speaker is fully conscious of it. Then, about implementation also, there is a committee of this House. What has been said, I do not like to repeat. But I crave your indulgence for reading out certain points. It was said that in the year 1957 we were really lagging behind. There were some complaints also and some strictures were also passed by the committee. We tried to make improvements, and ultimately, the latest position is this. The Committee on Government Assurances, consisting of representatives from all parties, made the following observation:

"Out of 4323 assurances given by the Ministers from the 1st to 15th sessions of the Second Lok Sabha, as many as 4,108 have

been implemented upto 24-3-1962. It is expected that another batch of statements containing fulfilled assurances will be laid on the Table on the 30th March, 1962. This indicates that more than 95 per cent of the assurances have been fulfilled upto 24th March, 1962, and still more will be fulfilled before the termination of the current session. Such a large percentage of fulfilled assurances reflects credit upon the Government and specially—

I do not want to say it myself—

"the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and his Department whose efforts have achieved this remarkable result. The Committee appreciate their performance."

I would not take the time of the House. I would like to set an example. I have been asking my colleagues that not more than 20 per cent of the time allotted to the Demands should be taken by the Ministers. I think I have confined myself to that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The point raised by me has not been answered. The point is that the Ministers should intimate to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs in advance what Bills they want to introduce, what other items they want to bring up, etc. It is not done. It was never adhered to.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: You, Sir, have mentioned about it, from your experience and your knowledge, by going through the correspondence; yesterday, you told the House—I do not like to say all these things. But as I told you yesterday, I have written to all my colleagues. We are sticking to it and in future, any Bill which is not—

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In future only?

Sari Satya Narayan Sinha: Even in this session we tried to do that. Of course, some unforeseen things may happen or some important things may occur, and exceptions will be there. This time also we have followed it. Ordinarily, for any will which is not introduced by the middle of any session, I will not take the responsibility of putting it through in that very session. We have already made it clear.

As regards the Official Language Bill—I do not like to refer to the point that it was not referred to in the President's Address—you remember that sometime before we had decided in the Business Advisory Committee that because of this emergency, we should not bring this kind of legislation, but later, we discussed the point; some pressure was brought—political consideration also—I do not like to say all these things before the House. The hon. Members know all about it. Therefore, we decided to bring it forward. There is nothing wrong in it. But such things will happen in future also. All that I say is generally, all the Bills which are to be passed in a particular session will be placed before the House by the middle of that session.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In the first fortnight.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Before I conclude, I would like to pay tribute to all the workers of my department, particularly the Secretary, without whose co-operation these achievements would not have been possible, the achievements which have been appreciated by the House.

Lastly, a word about my Deputy Whip and Whips. Such a loyal and devoted band of lieutenants is very difficult to get. I have no adequate words to express my gratitude for all their co-operation.

Dr L. M. Singhvi: May I ask one question?

Mr. Speaker: Yes; he did not avail of the opportunity to speak.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I do not mind that, because I did not want to add to the boquets that were showered upon the Minister. The Minister of Works, Housing and Rehabilitation said that there were certain distinguished parliamentarians for whom certain allotments were made. Clarifying it further, when he was replying to the debate on the demands of his Ministry, he said that there are more than a dozen houses in the patronage of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. We should certainly like to know what are the criteria for the allocation of these special houses which are in the patronage of the Minister and whether it is thought proper, after proper consideration, to keep such a number of bungalows in the special category?

Mr. Speaker: He does not give it to the Members of Parliament?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Because the hon. Member is new, he is raising this point. Other hon. Members know it. It is true—I do not regret it—that there are about 11 or 12 houses which are meant for the leaders of important groups and some ex-Governors or ex-Ministers. But mostly the leaders of the opposition parties in both the Houses are given these houses.

Mr. Speaker: What about the cut motion

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Minister has given promise of better performance in future. So, I do not wish to press the cut motion at this stage . . .

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Thank you.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: But if he does not live up to his promise and if he does not fulfil his promise, next year, I shall press it.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member have the leave of the House to withdraw his cut motion?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

The cut motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,90,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of Demand No. 108 relating to the Department of Parliamentary Affairs."

The motion was adopted.

17.18 hrs.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demands Nos. 24 to 40 and 119 to 126 relating to the Ministry of Finance.

Hon. Members desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating which of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMAND NO. 24—MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,71,76,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Ministry of Finance.'"

DEMAND NO. 25—CUSTOMS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 3,82,83,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of pay-

ment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Customs'."

DEMAND NO. 26—UNION EXCISE DUTIES

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 9,65,56,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Union Excise Duties.'"

DEMAND NO. 27—TAXES ON INCOME INCLUDING CORPORATION TAX ETC.

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 6,30,95,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Taxes on Income including Corporation Tax, etc.'"

DEMAND NO. 28—STAMPS

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,79,16,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Stamps.'"

DEMAND NO. 29—AUDIT

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 12,01,83,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Audit.'"