

[सध्मक्ष महोदय]

में था इस वास्ते मेरी शिकस्त हुई और बाकी मेम्बरों ने इसे पास कर दिया ।

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 15th March, 1965."

The motion was adopted.

12.25 hrs.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

NATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANISATION LIAISON COMMITTEE

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri Shah-nawaz Khan): I beg to move the following:—

"That in pursuance of the Ministry of Agriculture (now Food and Agriculture) Resolution No. F. 16-72/47-Policy, dated the 8th November, 1948, as amended from time to time, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves to serve as members of the National Food and Agriculture Organisation Liaison Committee for the next term."

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): This is a Committee which has been in existence for a number of years but it has not been given any effective work. It is convened only once, at the most twice a year. It is not serving even as an ornamental committee, whereas in other countries like America and Canada, and even in England, this Committee has been given plenty of opportunity to express itself after studying the various agricultural problems, both for the benefit of the local government as well as for the FAO. In this country this Committee has been very much neglected. It is proper that whenever such a motion is brought forward in this House, dealing with national as well as international mat-

ters, a report of the activities of that Committee during the previous term of office, say for one year or two years, should be circulated to the members so that they would be able to see whether it is really functioning and serving any useful purpose or not.

Mr. Speaker: The question is.....

Shri Ranga: Could we not expect a reply to my observations?

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri C. Subramaniam): We will certainly take this into consideration.

Mr. Speaker: They will consider it. When a responsible member raises a point, they will certainly consider it.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): So the rest are irresponsible?

Mr. Speaker: I never meant that Shri Priya Gupta is as responsible as anybody else.

Now the question is:

"That in pursuance of the Ministry of Agriculture, (now Food and Agriculture) Resolution No. F. 16-72/47, policy, dated the 8th November, 1948, as amended from time to time, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves to serve as members of the National Food and Agriculture Organisation Liaison Committee for the next term."

The motion was adopted.

12.37 hrs.

POINT UNDER RULE 377

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to place certain points before this august House under rule 377. The requisite previous permission of the hon. Speaker has already been communicated to me for it. Yesterday I tried to raise the same point under rule 376, but I did not

succeed. If I had raised this point under rule 376, then I would have formulated my propositions in a manner which would have required a definite ruling from you. Today I will formulate them in a manner which will simply place the matter before the House and nothing more is to be done about it.

To begin with, I will state the facts out of which the propositions I want to place before this House arise. These facts relate to a question which is listed as No. 447 on yesterday's Starred Questions List. This question was sent by me, along with half a dozen other hon. Members of this House, whose names appear on the list, with the exception of Shri Dwivedy; but I think that must have been a clerical error and his name was omitted, not intentionally but by a mistake or oversight.

The next thing with regard to this question as it appears on the list is, that the question as originally submitted contained four substantial clauses, four substantial parts. The first part was, as it appears on the list, namely:

"whether it is a fact that in this year's Republic Day Parade, the Sikh soldiers were excluded from the pageant of the period-soldiers of historical India;"

The second part, part (b), asked whether it is also a fact that a hand-out was distributed by the Defence Ministry, saying that the Sikhs had been excluded because they appeared in the pages of history only after the 18th century. That part has been excluded and I was given no notice of it and the first news I received of it was when this list came to my notice. The third part of this question was,—if the pretence, the excuse which is given in this hand-out, if it is correct, then the third part of the question was—whether or not it is a fact that certain developments with regard to the role of the Sikh soldiery and the Sikh military power are within the knowledge of the Government, such as relate to the period of 17th and 18th cen-
 2458 (A) LSD—5.

turies. Certain definite historical happenings were listed there. One of them was whether the Government are aware that in the year 1609 the first Sikh militia was recruited and also whether the Government are aware that in the year 1623 this Sikh militia inflicted crushing defeat on imperial Mughals, led by its veteran generals; thirdly, whether Government are aware that in the year 1710 the Sikhs established a sovereign republic in the heart of northern India; fourthly, whether the Government are aware that in the year 1748, after capturing Jullundur Doab, the Grand Sikh Army declared itself a State; and, lastly, whether the Government are aware that in 1799 the Sikhs had captured Lahore and made it a permanent capital of the Sikh Commonwealth. This was the third part of the question.

This was omitted and, as it seems to me, it might have been omitted under the pretence of rule 41, clause (xiv), which says that no information will be asked about past historical incidents. But this, as it seems to me, was not properly done; it was improperly done because it is clear that no such information was sought but it was sought to confront the Government with hard facts that fly in the face of the earlier clause which had been omitted.

The last part of the question was: If these facts are correct, whether the Sikhs were excluded not for the reasons given in the hand-out but they were excluded for some political reasons. This has been omitted and a new part has been added which says:-

"if so, the reasons therefor?"

The points which I wish to bring to the notice of this august House are: firstly, the manner in which this question has been truncated is a manner which might raise suspicions in the minds of some that it has been done with a slant, with a purpose, and also the fact that I was not taken into confidence—I was not informed that the question was going to be rephras-

[Shri Kapur Singh]

ed in this manner—to some extent fortified this implication.

The second point which I wish to bring to the notice of this House in connection with 'his question is that it has been placed at number 447 while the first question is 425. Everyday almost 25 questions are listed and, as the hon. House is aware, we cannot finish more than half a dozen questions everyday. In view of this known fact, it is open, it is within the power of the Secretariat of you, Sir, to place questions on the list in such a way that although a question has been admitted as a starred question, which gives opportunities for asking supplementaries, although the question might be so listed, by a manipulation of its placement in the list, which is within the power of the Secretariat of you, Sir, it can be turned into an unstarred question quietly and without giving any reasons.

These two matters are such that require very earnest consideration by you. I say nothing more on this matter except that this state of affairs requires a second look from you to obviate the types of doubts and restlessness which it arouses in our minds.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I might be allowed; then, probably, there might be no need for any other hon. Member to comment on it. Perhaps, there would be surprise all round as to why I have allowed it.

Shri H. N. Mugerjee (Calcutta—Central): Surprise and also something else.

Mr. Speaker: It might really be something else; that can be inferred from that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): He would not say that.

Mr. Speaker: I have to explain that (Interruption). If I am allowed

to give my explanation, probably hon. Members might be satisfied.

Everyday it is clear that I am not allowing any Member to raise anything here about any question, call-attention notice or any other notice which I have disallowed in my Chamber. I always advise the hon. Member to see me in my Chamber if he wants a revision of my order. That was exactly what I did when Shri Kapur Singh wrote to me about it. But he challenged my authority. He said that I had no authority to do that and he wanted to place it before the House.

I do not know and I would not impute any motives really, but I was in a very difficult position. It is embarrassing even now. Hon. Members would realise that if I had allowed it, I was in a difficult position; and if I had disallowed it, then too I was in another difficult position—in both cases; they would realise. I do not know what purpose Sardar Kapur Singh has in insisting upon it that this was beyond my powers to cut the question and modify it in some other form.

The first thing he says is that he had four parts to this question and that his question has been truncated. Then he refers to rule 41. I will read out to hon. Members part (c) of the question so that they may see whether it was really done with any purpose, with any motive or with anything in my mind that I should debar or preclude him from putting it before the House. Part (c) reads:—

“whether it is a historical fact that the first Sikh militia was recruited in 1609 that inflicted heavy defeats on Mughal Imperial troops; the first Sikh sovereign Republic was established in 1707; the Sikh people, led by the Dal Khalsa, the Grand Sikh Army, declared themselves a State in 1748; and Sikhs founded an Empire and a Commonwealth in 1799 with Lahore as Capital;”

Are these facts that are primarily in the possession of Government that I should ask them to give this answer on the floor of this House? Are historical facts to be ascertained from the Government and do Ministers have to give a reply about them so that I should have allowed it? I allowed that question, so far as the other facts were concerned, as a starred question.

Then, I am accused that this was done with some purpose and that that part was omitted. Then again it is said that his number was somewhat different and this has been given another number. It is exactly in the sequence of time in which we receive any question that we put it. He might find out and ascertain first whether any injury has been done to him in that respect and then he should impute any purpose or motives or anything to me or to anybody else.

I am rather pained at this and I felt distressed because he challenged my authority. If any hon. Member reads rule 41, it would be clear to him that it shall not contain arguments, inferences, ironical expressions, imputations and all those things and, I believe, that this part did contain everything that is prohibited. When I have disallowed it, that authority is challenged here. The letter also that was written to me really pained me very much. Yesterday also I was trying to read it out before the House and he insists on it again. I assure him that there was no motive, no purpose. I may err; I may make a mistake; but there was nothing in that that I had in my mind that I should debar him from bringing up anything if it could be done under the rules.

Therefore I will request all hon. Members kindly to desist from such imputations, from such motives to be imputed to the Speaker. Democracy would work only so long as the Chair is respected. If you do not want me, remove me at once. This House has that authority. I have not a shadow of right to remain here for a minute

if I am not wanted and if the House does not desire me.

श्री शिव नारायण (बार्सी) : हाउस आपके साथ है, माननीय सदस्य को बार्सी मांगने चाहिए ।

Mr. Speaker: But so long as I am here and the House tolerates me, of course, some confidence should be reposed in me. If some hon. Member has a grievance and if he does not want to come to me, he can write to me and certainly I will send him a reply. If it be not proper for him to write and he thinks that it is not desirable, I am even prepared to go to him if he calls me and summons me.

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): It is too long. What is this explanation? We are not interested in these petty quarrels.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): I do not think a discussion is necessary on this.

Mr. Speaker: I will advise hon. Members not to have any discussion on this.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): This is a very important issue, as a matter of fact. You are setting up a precedent and I do not know where this House will stand if such a precedent is to be accepted. The precedent is that you permitted Shri Kapur Singh to bring it up. There is no question of imputing any motives whatsoever.

Shri Kapur Singh: I have done nothing of the sort; I have been very careful.

Mr. Speaker: We said that it was done with a purpose.

Shri Kapur Singh: No, Sir; my submission was clear that it might raise a suspicion that it is done with a purpose and circumstances should be avoided in which such suspicions are likely to arise.....(Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: I do not think anything more is necessary.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Speaker, Sir....

Mr. Speaker: The House shall now take the Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Ministers. (*Interruptions*). The Members would now excuse me. I am not going to allow anything more.

Shri Kapur Singh: If you will kindly permit me, I may point out that you have misunderstood the position given in the letter. I never challenged your authority.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry I misunderstood it. Then, that closes the matter, **Shri A. K. Sen.**

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order. I consider this....

Mr. Speaker: I request the Member not to resume it. That discussion is closed.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I am on a point of order. Sir, I would like to understand—I am quoting the rule..

Mr. Speaker: I am not allowing him.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Am I not permitted to raise a point of order? Is it the privilege only of certain people?

Mr. Speaker: How can a point of order arise when the previous business is finished. There is nothing before the House. How can a point of order arise here?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: The point of order arises—I am quoting the rule....

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: One can raise a point of order at any time. There is nothing before the House now.

Mr. Speaker: I request him not to press for it.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Then are we to take it that no points of order will be listened to?

Mr. Speaker: Not at this stage.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: At what stage then?

Mr. Speaker: Not now.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I walk out of the House under protest. We cannot tolerate this. (*Interruptions*)

(*Shri Harish Chandra Mathur then left the House.*)

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): The point of order must be allowed, whatever it is, coming from this side or that side.

12.51 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—
Contd.

The Minister of Law and Social Security (**Shri A. K. Sen**): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have had a discussion on the motion of No-Confidence moved by Mr. Surendranath Dwivedy since yesterday. It is necessary for the purpose of clarification of the issues involved to appreciate what was before the Cabinet Sub-Committee and the Prime Minister for decision and what was the action contemplated. You will permit me to cover the ground again a little briefly so that we may appreciate what the issues are in this particular case.

Sir, there was a charge preferred by certain Members of the Opposition of the Orissa Assembly and in Parliament here which was put before the President in August, 1964. I venture to say that the memorialists certainly wanted the President to make some inquiry into the matter and to arrive at some conclusions. The President in a constitutional Government functions even in such matters, in his constitutional capacity, that is, on the advice of the Prime Minister and the proper course, therefore was to refer it to the Prime Minister for such advice as he was ready to give. The charge ran into many items, big and small—some were of a rather serious nature and others were of a, more or less, trifling