

**श्री रामसेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :**  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या मंत्री महोदय कल की दुर्घटनाओं के बारे में भी विवरण देंगे ?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The statement will be laid on the Table of the House.

**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** I lay the statement on certain recent railway accidents on the Table of the House.

**Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani):** Will you allow us to put questions on this tomorrow?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Hon. Members may study it first.

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जानकारी चाहता हूँ कि कल जो रेलवे की दुर्घटनायें हुईं और आज भी जो पेट्रोल के जलने के बारे में अखबार में छपा है, क्या वे भी इस बयान में शामिल हैं ।

**ड० राम सुभग सिंह :** नहीं ।

**उपाध्यक्ष महोदय :** माननीय सदस्य स्टेटमेंट को देखें ।

**Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur):** I had tabled a calling-attention-notice about the accident that had taken place about 135 k.m. from Calcutta, in which about 28 wagons had caught fire and petrol had been destroyed. I have not received any information about what has happened to that.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I have no information. I shall find out....

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** We have not been told whether it has been admitted or not admitted, whether it has been disallowed or anything of that kind.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It has been disallowed by the Speaker.

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** How can it be disallowed?

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I do not know. The hon. Member may ask the Speaker about it.

15.09 hrs.

#### MOTIONS OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** There are several motions of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers....

**An. hon. Member:** Please read them all.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The first notice of the motion is by Shri H. N. Mukerjee and others. The motion is slightly edited as follows:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers."

May I request those Members who are in favour of leave being granted..

**Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot):** I would request that the other motions should also be read out so that hon. Members may know which one they want to support. Mine is next on the Order Paper.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Does the hon. Member want me to read out all the motions?

**Shri M. R. Masani:** Yes, those which are being pressed.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The first one is by Shri H. N. Mukerjee, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, Shri Indrajit Gupta and Shri K. K. Warior,

"That this House has no confidence in the Council of Ministers."

The second one is by Shri M. R. Masani—

“That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers which, because of its wrong economic policies, has brought the country to a state of bankruptcy leading to the devaluation of the national currency.”

The third is by Shri U. M. Trivedi,

“That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers”.

The next one is by Shri Maniram Bagri,

“यह सदन वर्तमान मंत्रि परिषद् में अपने विश्वास का अभाव प्रकट करता है”

The next is by Shri P. K. Vasudevan Nair,

“That this House has no confidence in the Council of Ministers.”

15.12 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

**Mr. Speaker:** The next is by Shri Madhu Limaye,

“यह सदन वर्तमान मंत्रिपरिषद् में अपने विश्वास का अभाव प्रकट करता है”

The next is by Shri Ranga and Shri M. R. Masani,

“That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers”.

Then there is one by Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia; it is just the same as Shri Madhu Limaye's. Then there is one by Shri Prakash Vir Shastri:

“यह सभा मंत्रिपरिषद् में अविश्वास प्रकट करती है।”

Then by Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri:

“This House expresses its lack of confidence in the Council of Ministers on the following grounds”....

I suppose I need not read the grounds. Any way, the policy of economic subservience which it has been following in relation to USA, its decision to devalue the rupee; failure to condemn US aggression against Vietnam; total bungling and mismanagement in regard to people's food; failure to hold the price line; resort to anti-democratic measures..

The next is by Shri S. M. Banerjee. He is not here.

Then, by Shri S. N. Dwivedy:

“That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers”.

In the ballot, Shri Mukerjee's notice got precedence. I will ask those who are in favour of his motion to rise in their places. He has not to ask for leave.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy** (Kendrapara): I just want to know from you as to when this new procedure has been adopted. According to the rules, a motion of no-confidence can be tabled on any day and on that very day it must be put before the House. But it seems there was a ballot of these motions. When there are motions of no-confidence, will there be balloting?

**Mr. Speaker:** If there is precedence in the receipt of the motion, then we can decide. But if all are received at about 10 o'clock, at the same time, there is no other alternative or remedy but to have a ballot.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty** (Barackpore): There is one point. We got a notification in the bulletin a little while ago saying that you have changed by direction the rule or convention by which motions of no-confidence were sent in. By that bulletin, we were to send in notices of no-confidence motions just before the commencement of the sitting on the day on which the matter was proposed to

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

be raised, and these should be given when the list of Business for the day was circulated. Therefore, naturally all of them came together. This was the position.

**Mr. Speaker:** May be. Those in favour of granting him leave may rise in their places.

**Shri Surendranath Dwivedy:** Should he not ask for leave?

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not necessary. Directly I am required to put it to the House. Those in favour of leave being granted may kindly rise in their places—There are more than 50 Members in favour. The Motion is admitted.

Now so far as the date is concerned, it will be fixed. Does Shri Mukerjee want to say anything?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : (देवास) इस के लिये चार दिन होने चाहिये ।

**Mr. Speaker:** The rule is that not more than 10 days should elapse. Within that it has to be discussed. The Leader of the House and the Opposition may just fix the time.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): 10 days is the ceiling.

**Mr. Speaker:** That was what I said.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta Central) I wanted to ask for the earliest possible commencement of the discussion, because I want to make a submission to you in this respect. The agenda circulated shows that the Finance Minister is to move a motion regarding the present economic situation in the country.

Now, to my mind, it is patent that all parliamentary conventions and canons of propriety require that the discussion of this Motion should never be permitted to precede the discussion of the no-confidence Motion. The genesis

of this no-confidence Motion is very well known to you and even in spite of the directions which you issued towards the end of the last session, which were not available to most of us, different parties sent in notices of a no-confidence motion a long time ago. What they did was largely on account of the provocation given by the egregious conduct of Government in telling Parliament repeatedly that a thing like devaluation would never take place; but stealthily; like a thief in the night, soon after bundling off Parliament they just announced to the world that the Indian rupee had been devalued. That was one of the principal reasons which led to all parties combining—even though my friends to my right did not choose to stand at that time—to express their want of confidence in the Government. Some of us have other grounds of very great importance also, which we shall try to press as we try to justify our motion of no-confidence.

My submission to you is that Parliamentary propriety requires that when a motion of no-confidence is before the House, when the intention to move a motion of no-confidence in the House has been announced by different parties well in advance of the session of Parliament having been convoked, it was very improper on the part of Government to come forward, again stealthily, which seems to be its characteristic, with a motion for a debate in Parliament on a subject which pertains very largely to the no-confidence motion. I take it, subject to correction, that the best Parliamentary practice is that when there is a motion of no-confidence pending, the earliest possible date should be fixed for the commencement of its discussion and some routine matter could be discussed in the meantime. On a little while has got to elapse after the leave was granted and before that debate commenced. That is why the minimum possible time should elapse between leave being granted by the

House and the commencement of the discussion of the no-confidence motion. Government has behaved in a manner which parliamentary propriety requires should not be upheld. Government is itself in the dock, and Government comes forward to use its majority in Parliament to have a vote, as already some amendments to the Finance Ministers' motion suggest in support of Government's economic policies which are coming under fire. They want to confront the House and the country with a position where this House, because of the party composition, gets committed in advance on the economic situation which is very largely the result of the Government's policy.

Therefore, from that point of view they are trying to circumvent the constitutional effect of the motion of the no-confidence motion. This, again, is working on the sly, this stealthy process of trying to steal the limelight, when they have not that kind of political talent in this House to do something about their own policy and justify it before the world. This kind of stealthy practice is something which goes against the grain of parliamentary decency.

That is why I say that you, as Speaker, who naturally champions the supreme role of Parliament in our political life should direct that after all, the House having given leave for the moving of this no-confidence Motion, this no-confidence Motion should be discussed as quickly as ever it is possible and, therefore, such discussion as sought by Shri Sachin Chaudhuri should be postponed, if at all it is necessary, to a later date.

My submission, therefore, is that you should give us a pronouncement on this action of Government, and my sorrow is that you have, on account of certain rules under which you operate, chosen to permit Government to insist on having this thing first on the agenda.

In the other House they are not making this same kind of motion as  
948 (A) LS—8.

normally they do. When a Minister comes forward with a motion with regard to the economic or any other kind of situation, what happens generally is that in the other House they have a corresponding debate on the same day, but this time they have chosen not to do so because their intention is only to subvert, if they possibly can because they will not succeed, because there is going to be a barrage of criticism of Government in all spheres impinging upon their conscience, if they have any, they are trying to get rid of whatever parliamentary obligations they have got by throwing to the winds, riding rough shod over all canons of parliamentary propriety.

I would submit to you very respectfully, therefore, that we expect from you some kind of direction which would dissuade Government from perpetrating this kind of constitutional fraud on Parliament.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : मैं समय के सम्बन्ध में एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि आप आज श्री सचीन्द्र चौधरी के प्रस्ताव को न लें। बिजिनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी की मीटिंग होने जा रही है। उसमें हम लोग बात करें और उसमें यह तय किया जाए कि अविश्वाम के प्रस्ताव को पहले हम लोग लें या श्री सचीन्द्र चौधरी साहब के प्रस्ताव को। अभी मेरे पास किताब नहीं है। लेकिन जिस कैम्पियन की किताब का मैंने उल्लेख किया है उसमें प्रेसीडेंट के बारे में कुछ उदाहरण दिये गये हैं और उसमें किस को प्राथमिकता देनी चाहिये इसके बारे में कुछ निर्णय हैं जिनसे आपको रोजनी मिलेगी। इसलिये मेरा मुझाव है कि श्री सचीन्द्र चौधरी को आप आज इजाजत न दें। बिजिनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी की बैठक में दूसरे विरोधी दल वालों को भी बुला कर आप इसके बारे में फैसला करें।

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** This is no:

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

for the first time that this kind of thing has happened. The House is aware that on the last occasion also when there was a no confidence motion . . .

**Shri Warrior (Trichur):** You played the same trick.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** There is no question of trick.

**Shri Warrior:** Last time you played a trick. This time that becomes a precedent.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** There is nothing wrong in playing tricks one against the other. This is what Parliament means. (*Interruptions*). It is a question of wits against wits. If you are lacking in wits, I cannot help you. (*Interruptions*). When you spoke we all kept quiet. If you do not want to hear us, let the Speaker decide without hearing anything from us.

This momentous decision was taken when the House was not in session, and therefore we decided that such an important decision should be placed before the House as soon as the House met. We never thought that a no confidence motion would be moved against us. Certainly we never expected. Very soon it will be proved whether you are justified in provoking us or not. There is no doubt about it. Anyway, you have the right to move a motion of no confidence, as you have tried half a dozen times in the course of two months; you try seven times more, I wish you the joy of it.

Therefore, we decided that as soon as the House meets the first thing we will do is to have this before the House to discuss. So far as the result is concerned, whether you discuss this motion or discuss the motion of no confidence it is going to make no difference. The only satisfaction you will have is to hurl abuses at us. That you can do on either occasion. Hard

words are not going to break bones, and they are not going to break our bones.

**Shri Daji (Indore):** First of all, I want to express my regret at the way the hon. Minister has replied. He is also the Leader of the House which he again and again forgets. He should himself set an example of decency and decorum to the House. When he himself provokes us by such words and such ideas, he cannot blame if some Members of the Opposition get out of control. I want you to give a ruling on this. Is a Minister entitled to say, "I wish you the joy of it. Hard words are not going to break bones" etc.? It may not be unparliamentary. (*Interruptions*).

Rule 198(3) says:

"If leave is granted under sub-rule (2), the Speaker may, after considering the state of business in the House, allot a day or days or part of a day for the discussion of the motion."

I submit the Minister has made a statement, he says he got the motion fixed, the Finance Minister to move the motion, without expecting that there would be a vote of no confidence, as Government has always been coming before the House at the earliest with important business. But, since the Government knows that the no confidence motion has been moved and leave has been granted to the House, is it not in the fitness of things that apart from routine matters, such an important motion should not be taken up for discussion. Ordinarily, a Government, any Government, any self-respecting Government, any Government worth its salt should come forward to establish the confidence of the House. A Government which continues when a no confidence motion is pending is a Government which continues on sufferance. (*Interruptions*).

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** This is parliamentary practice.

**Shri Daji:** I respectfully submit that if the hon. Members want to shout, I can shout more than all the Members put together.

I want to address myself to the Government and to you to advise and direct the Government. Will it be in the fitness of things that an important matter like the economic policy and devaluation, which is the main subject of the motion of no confidence, is taken up and discussed and voted upon, and the main purpose and function and the constitutional right of the House to censure the Government, to express its lack of confidence is related to a secondary position? Will we be upholding the best traditions of the Constitution?

The hon. Minister has let the cat out of the bag. He says it was done in the past. In the past it was done over our protest, and now that is being held up as a precedent. I submit there is no precedent in the House of Commons that when a motion of no confidence has been moved, the same subject has been discussed before the motion of no confidence is taken up. We do not wish to depart from that tradition. I submit that this devalued Finance Minister of this devalued Government has no right to come forward with this motion. This is an absolutely devalued Government and the country will not tolerate a motion from the devalued Finance Minister of this devalued Government till the motion of no confidence is discussed. We do not want that this motion should be taken up before the no confidence motion.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod):** It is not a question of rule or precedent, it is a question of self-respect, dignity, honour and respect for parliamentary democracy and also for the Opposition. When a no confidence motion is admitted, Government have first to establish the confidence of Parliament before they can discuss the economic situation. How can we hear them about the economic situation in the country when

they do not establish that Parliament has confidence in them. So, it is not a question of rule of precedent as Shri Satya Narayan Sinha has said.

He has ridiculed us by saying that we have so many times in the past brought no confidence motions. I do not want to refer to it. It is a question of the dignity and honour and self-respect of the Government. We will not be here to discuss the economic situation unless they first establish the confidence of Parliament. So, at least let them postpone it till they establish the confidence of Parliament.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehradun):** I only want to submit this to the House and particularly to the Opposition. It is universally recognised not only in India but everywhere in a democracy that it is the privilege of the opposition to move a motion of no confidence whenever they feel like. Therefore, nobody can resist it. Of course we discuss it on merits. I do not want to minimise or just curb their right at all. After all opposition means that. They must express what their views are; they must be given the first privilege. But will they be generous enough to see that after such a big decision had been taken when Parliament was not in session, was it not the duty of the Finance Minister....

**Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon):** why did they take such a decision? They were selling the country.

**Shri Tyagi:** Was it not the duty of the Finance Minister to come before Parliament?

**Shri Daji:** He must have come before Parliament before taking this decision, not afterwards for a rubber stamp on it.

**Mr. Speaker:** This was not the question that I had to decide.

**Shri Tyagi:** It is not the privilege of the opposition to be passionate. My suggestion is that when a no-confidence motion had been given notice, it must always get priority. There is no doubt about it because no government can

[Shri Tyagi]

act with a no-confidence motion hanging over its head. My suggestion, therefore, is that these motions are given on the basis of the latest economic policy. The Finance Minister has given notice of a motion to discuss economic policy. All these no-confidence motions can be a part of it. Instead of passing a resolution that the House approves of this policy, the Opposition can just put forward its motion of no-confidence and say that they do not accept it. So, the no-confidence motion will come. Instead of having two discussions on the same subject why not have one discussion?

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not want to hear any debate on that. According to the rules the only limit laid down is that it should not be more than ten days after it has been admitted. So far as precedence of the work is concerned, it is the privilege of the government to put any business at any place. The Business Advisory Committee can only allot time and not give priority or precedence to anything. Now that these appeals and suggestions had been made or objections had been taken, the government can fix any time as early as possible; it has this right.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** You should decide. If this agenda does not come from you, if it comes from the government, I will throw it away.

**Mr. Speaker:** We issue the agenda but I have not to dictate which business is to be taken up first. It is the government's business to put what business they want to be taken up first.....

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** The House can supersede or override their decision.

**Mr. Speaker:**...during the government time, not during the other time.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** The House has the ultimate power, not the government.

**Shri Tyagi:** Shall we discuss the same subject twice?

**Mr. Speaker:** By virtue of their being returned by majority votes, it is their privilege to say which business should be taken up first. I will say that it should be taken up as early as possible; I cannot give priority.

**Shri Daji:** This should have precedence over the motion of the Finance Minister.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is not in my power. (*Interruptions.*)

**Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah):** I want to assist you. There is an important rule, rule No. 25 which says that priority should be given to government business. This rule says that on days allotted for the transaction of government business, such business shall have precedence and the Secretary shall arrange that business in such order as the Speaker may, after consultation with the Leader of the House, determine. This resolution of the Finance Minister has been brought on the agenda on account of this rule. The other is the motion of no-confidence which had been admitted now. My submission is that assistance in this regard will come from rules 338 and 186 and the position will be like this. If the Finance Minister's motion is defeated, the Government goes. So far as the motion of no-confidence is concerned, it will have to come after the debate on economic policies. No debate is permissible under the rules on economic affairs.... (*Interruptions.*) I have not yet completed my say.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Now, the question is whether I can appeal to government to forego their right to have time for this discussion. Persuasion is a different thing. I will ask them to have it as early as possible but I cannot compel them by saying: I am taking it up just now.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** May I respectfully submit that this particular no-confidence motion is dealing with a subject which is not like any other subject. This devaluation was done after having misled the country; they

misled us in the House; they misled us very much more categorically in the other House by saying that there would not be any devaluation. After that today they bring forward this motion and as the Leader of the House says, it is a trick I want to point out that rule 25 which he is quoting is with regard to the arrangement of ordinary business.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not quoting that.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** I want to say that there is a distinction made in the rules about the ordinary business and the business which has to be taken up with regard to the vote of no-confidence—Chapter XVII contains provisions which specify how the motion of no-confidence shall be admitted. It says that after leave is granted the Speaker may after considering the state of business in the House allot a day or days or part of a day for the discussion of the motion. So, it is within the power of the Speaker after having seen what business is to be transacted after having listened to us and having paid full attention to the points of propriety which we have raised to make a distinction between rule 25 in which precedence is given by the Government to ordinary business and this particular matter. This motion is nothing but an attempt to sabotage the no-confidence motion and therefore you should not allow it to be taken up now.

**Shri Bade (Khargone):** This motion is with regard to economic situation and we have also tabled our motion because of devaluation. There will again be double discussion.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not concerned with it; it is for the government to say whether there would be double discussion.

**Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai):** The Leader of the House has said that it does not make any difference if this particular thing is discussed independently or along with the "No-confidence" motion. If so, let him explain

what is his objection to this being held over. Let them at least explain.

**Mr. Speaker:** If the Government agrees that it should be taken up as the first item, I have no objection but if they want time, then certainly I cannot deprive them of that right of theirs which is inherent in the rules. The rule is—not more than ten days. I can only ask them to fix sometime as early as possible. When can this be had?

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** Next Monday... (*Interruptions.*)

**Shri Daji:** The hon. Minister has made a statement and that statement was that he can play tricks. The point is, can the House allow the Minister to go away with a statement? The point is, he has openly suggested that this is a trick; we can play tricks. But this is certainly our objection: it is constitutionally most improper to allow the Government to play tricks with the fundamental rights, fundamental issues, of the people and of Parliament, particularly, after the crime of devaluation, after selling our country lock, stock and barrel, to foreigners, after devaluing the very values of the rupee.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** Let me make it quite clear, Sir. Somebody mentioned about tricks. I said there is nothing wrong with the word "trick". All that I said was, that it always happens in Parliament; everyday it happens; it is always wits against wits. What else is it?

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave that there. Shri Samanta.

**Shri Daji:** I was having my say. After all this background, when the Parliament was not in session, they devalued the rupee. They first said that the rupee will not be devalued. When Parliament was not in session, they devalued the rupee. After that, when we come forward with a motion of no-confidence.—I must invite your attention to this—the Government wants to steal the thunder of the whole thing. This is most shameful. No Government can be more shameless. The Government must be ashamed of



[Shri Daji]

itself, when a vote of no-confidence is pending, to come forward with their motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Shri Samanta.

**Shri S. C. Samanta** (Tamluk): I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for regulating the quality of certain seeds for sale, and for matters connected therewith, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be extended up to the last day of the first week of the next session."

**Shri Daji:** Sir, I was on my legs. What is the decision on the other point? We have not decided anything. You called me to order, and you called Shri Samanta.

**Mr. Speaker:** I called Shri Daji to order: I asked him to sit down, and called Shri Samanta. He has had his say, and so he should sit down now.

**Shri Daji:** The point is, this House will not accept this impropriety of the Government. We are not going to accept this impropriety on the part of the devalued Minister to come and move his motion. (*Interruption*). The same thing has happened once before. The House is not willing to discuss first the no-confidence motion. The Government is not willing to have it first. This is becoming the habit of the Government. Whenever we move a motion, the Government comes forward with another motion and steals the thunder out of it.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. He should sit down now.

**Shri Daji:** We cannot allow the Government, to proceed in this way. We cannot allow the Government, which has the conscience to sell the prestige of this country to others, to proceed like this. How can we allow the Finance Minister to come forward with

his motion, when a motion of no-confidence is pending? It is constitutional decorum to have the discussion of the no-confidence motion first. The motion of no-confidence is there before the House, which is a weapon in the hands of the Opposition, and we want to censure the Government. That motion has been accepted by the House, for discussion. Once having accepted the motion for discussion, we cannot listen to the Finance Minister on his motion, when the Government have shamelessly sold the country to American imperialists.

**Mr. Speaker:** Will he stop or not?

**Shri Daji:** Let the Government change their attitude.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I have asked Shri Daji thrice to stop.

**Shri Daji:** This Government cannot be allowed to continue in office, because this Government has forfeited all the right and respect and decency, and all the rights and constitutional propriety by devaluation. This Government is a Government of 57 paise, having created just 57 paise for a rupee. This Government is a Government of 57 paise; this Government cannot be allowed to continue. The motion of no-confidence has been admitted in the House. Once it is admitted, what is the motion about the economic situation in the country?

**Mr. Speaker:** I have called him to order thrice. He goes on yet.

**Shri Daji:** This kind of thing goes on; it cannot go on like that. Both the motions cannot be sought to be proceeded with like this, simultaneously. The motion of no-confidence should come first.

**Shri Vasudevan Nair** (Ambalapuzha): We cannot accept the Finance Minister's motion now.

**Mr. Speaker:** Whether you accept it or not . . .

**Shri Daji:** Till this Government establishes its confidence, till this House establishes its confidence in the Government, we will not allow any

other thing to go on. Let the Government vote it out. (*Interruption*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Mr. Daji, I had asked you to sit down thrice or four times.

**Shri Daji:** Till the Government establishes its confidence, this Government has no right to continue, and has certainly no right to bring forward its motion, when a motion of no-confidence is pending before the House.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** We had tabled the motion of no-confidence and you have taken a decision. That was in your jurisdiction; you have done it and we accepted it. But in regard to the motion by the Finance Minister, this submission has to be made. Here is a kind of Finance Minister who is in the dock, as the principal person responsible for these economic policies which are under attack, coming before Parliament to ask us to take into consideration the present economic situation which itself has degenerated to the extent it has happened. The Prime Minister and others in Government are equally responsible for this situation, and this Government has the gumption to come before Parliament, when a motion of no-confidence is hanging fire, with its motion, and for a trick or whatever else it might be, they put it on the agenda, using whatever authority they might or might not have under the rules.

Now, the whole question of parliamentary propriety and forms is now on the envil. As far as you are concerned,—I hesitate, because I want to put it in the most dignified possible parliamentary terms—I would certainly have expected of the Speaker of this House to make sure that nothing is said or done by Government or by any Member which as a whole deflates the reputation and the prestige of Parliament. If we discussed this matter, it would really amount to the deflation of prestige of Parliament. Individuals in this context do not matter; you might name Shri Daji or he might be pushed out

by the vote of the people over there, but that is neither here nor there. It is a question of prestige of Parliament which those people are putting into jeopardy because they consider that with their brute majority in their favour they can steamroll everything as long as they possibly can, because the election is in the offing and this is the pre-election year—six months or less, before the poll takes place.

Here is a motion of no-confidence sponsored by every single organised political party in Opposition in this Parliament, and in this context of things, the Government comes forward with a motion regarding the economic situation. I would say it is the responsibility of the Speaker to uphold the dignity and the authority of the House as a whole, irrespective of what happens to the Government of the day. If the Government of the day has behaved in a manner which smacks not only of trickery, as the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs let fall from his mouth,—but it smacks of something very much more it is political devilry of a sort which should not be permitted or tolerated. As far as you are concerned, you are in a position of supreme pre-eminence in the country. You can assert by an act of your own like the late Vithal-bhai Patel did many years ago in regard to the Public Safety Bill. If you cannot do it, the country will judge. Shri Ranga is here and possibly he recollects those days. A portrait has been put up here and I looked at it again. I was a young man at that time and I remember those days when he put the entire Government out of the picture. Those were the days of British domination. And we here have a free country, a sovereign State, with a flag of our own and with these mottoes: *Satyameva Jayate* and *Dharmachakra Pravartanaya* and all the rest of it. You are sitting there, representing the majesty of the country, and I am sorry to have to say that an impression is created in many minds that there is something like a green to whatever country—(*Interruption*)—I am putting it

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

in that way, because while the Government has the authority under the rules, the Speaker has the authority to say under the rules that such and such a thing should be done, and he has the discretion to decide so many things. In the Speaker vests the authority of the whole House. The elected representatives of the people are here, and they look up to you alone for support. That is why your position is of such pre-eminence, and I also expected from you that when the Government put it down, and when you knew the motion of no-confidence was coming up in Parliament, you could have put it down on a tentative basis and if the no-confidence motion was admitted, "I would call you," you could have said—keeping out the rest, and after bringing up some routine matters, the no-confidence motion could have started. That would have been an advertisement to the world of real democracy practised by this country.

I know that the Government of the day tried to tell the world that owing to oppression some have become the cruellest perpetrators! and the exciting incidents which took place this morning had taken place. They want to tell the world that there are elements in this country who are against Parliamentary government. The Prime Minister, I read somewhere, told a television audience in America about a party in this country behaving in a wrong manner and that kind of thing. They have got the advantage, and they can travel all over the world; they can say all that kind of thing to public audiences in different countries of the world. They can do so. We have only our own people to consider people in agony with whose feelings we have some kind of participation.

And now, what this Government tries to show goes against the grain of decency of Parliament; it does something which only goes to prove to the world that they have got a vote of confidence and they do not care a

damn for the Communist motion supported by some people, some footling little thing, which does not affect the country. That is the kind of impression that they want to produce before the world. Is that the way in which this country is to be administered and is that the way in which one should uphold Parliamentary Government? Is that the way, Sir, in which you as representing the finest traditions of Parliamentary propriety, should permit the Government to get away with this kind of political banditry? If this is the kind of pass to which parliamentary life has come, where do we stand? That is my humble submission.

Some hon. Members rose—

**Mr. Speaker:** How long would this continue? (*Interruptions.*)

**Shri Mohammad Elias** (Howrah). We are the elected Members of Parliament. Mr. Sachin Chaudhury and Mr. Asoka Mehta are all agents of the Pentagon. (*Interruptions.*)

**Shri Daji:** rose—

**Mr. Speaker:** I have allowed Mr. Daji to have his say.

**Shri Daji** Government refuses to protect democracy. I am seeking your protection. They are taking away the constitutional rights of the opposition. We want protection from you for saving parliamentary democracy. (*Interruptions.*)

**Mr. Speaker:** I would appeal to the Leaders of the Groups....

श्री ज० ब० सिंह (घोसी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मन्त्रों से हम कह रहे हैं.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं माननीय सदस्यों को सुन चुका हूँ ।

श्री ज० ब० सिंह : सुन तो आप रहे हैं, लेकिन कर कुछ नहीं रहे हैं, हमारे लिए यही मुश्किल है ।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** यह जरूरी नहीं है कि जो कुछ माननीय सदस्य कहें, मुझे उस को मानना चाहिए ।

**श्री दाजी :** यह जरूरी नहीं है कि जो कुछ हम कहें, आप उस को मानें, लेकिन यह भी जरूरी नहीं है कि जो कुछ गवर्नमेंट कहे, आप उस को मान लें । पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी इस तरह नहीं चलेगी । आपोजीशन को रेस्पॉन्सिबल होना चाहिए और गवर्नमेंट को भी रेस्पॉन्सिबल होना चाहिए । अगर गवर्नमेंट ने यह तय कर लिया है कि पार्लियामेंट के राइट्स के साथ मजाक किया जायेगा, तो आपोजीशन क्या कर सकती है ? हम पूरी कोशिश करते हैं कि आप के साथ को-ऑपरेट करें ।

**Mr. Speaker:** This will not go on record.

**Shri Daji: \*\***

**Mr. Speaker:** I am constrained to remark that this hon. Member has been intentionally and continuously obstructing the proceedings of the House. In spite of my best efforts he has continued in that manner. I would now ask him to leave the House (*Interruptions*). Order, order. There is an end to my patience. If the hon. Member is not prepared to listen, I may tell Shri Mukerjee that I have no remedy left now but to name the hon. Member. I have waited and waited (*Interruptions*). I have no remedy at all left now. I have to name the hon. member. I hereby name Shri Daji as the hon. Member has obstructed the proceedings continuously and deliberately.

**Shri Satya Narayan Sinha:** Sir, I beg to move:

"That Shri Daji, a Member of the House, named by the Speaker, be suspended from the service of the House for a fortnight."

**Shri Daji:** How can he move a motion? I am still on my legs. I have not yielded.

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

"That Shri Daji, a Member of the House, named by the Speaker be suspended from the service of the House for a fortnight."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Daji may go out of the House.

**Shri Daji:** When a No-Confidence Motion is pending, how can he move such a motion? There is no confidence in the Ministry. How can the Minister move a motion like that?

**Mr. Speaker:** I will ask the Marshal to go and persuade him to go out (*Interruptions*). Is Shri Daji going out or not?

**Some hon. Members:** No, no.

**Shri Mohammad Elias:** No..... (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** I would tell Shri Elias, that that is not the proper way. I have seen, in the case of Shri Banerjee as well, you are obstructing the execution of the orders passed by the House.

**Shri Mohammad Elias:** Shri Satya Narayan Sinha has no right to move such a motion when there is the motion of no-confidence.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is for me to say whether he has that right or not.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Sir, if you insist that the No-Confidence Motion shall not be taken.... (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. Let me hear her.

\*\*Not recorded.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Sir, we have not heard what motion has been adopted, whether the suspension is for the rest of the session or for a month.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is for a fortnight.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** It has been passed by virtue of the brute majority that they have got. But I would beg of you, Sir, again, at this stage to consider whether you should allow the discussion on the economic situation to take place when there is this No-confidence Motion pending.

**Mr. Speaker:** Other considerations can come only afterwards. I can consider anything else afterwards separately. First the orders of the House are to be carried out.

16.00 hrs.

**Shri Daji:** I am leaving the House to maintain the dignity of the House. But this Government is violating and raping parliamentary democracy and the people of this country will reply to this Government certainly. I am not the last to be heard; the people of India are the last to be heard and they will pass their verdict on those people who have sold our self-respect for a mess of pottage.... (*Interruptions*).

(*Shri Daji then left the House*)

**श्री जे० ब० सिंह :** हर एक अपोजीशन मेम्बर को निकालने के लिए आप नेम कर रहे हैं, इससे कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। कोई भी अपोजीशन मेम्बर यह टालरेट नहीं करेगा कि आप उससे कोई ऐडवांटेज देना तो दूर रहा, उसका हक भी देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हैं और गवर्नमेंट को सारी चीज आप कंसीड करते जा रहे हैं। सबेरे यही वाक्या हुआ और इस वक्त भी यही वाक्या हो रहा है और बराबर आप इस चीज को करते जा रहे हैं। हम लोगों के हक खत्म करते जा रहे हैं। मालूम

होता है कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर चुनकर नहीं आये हैं, केवल वही चुनकर आये हैं।

**Mr. Speaker:** Now Shri S. C. Samanta might move his motion.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** Now that Shri Daji has left the House.... (*Interruptions*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Nothing will be recorded when members are speaking simultaneously.

(*Interruptions*)\*\*\*

14.02 hrs.

### SEEDS BILL

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION OF REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

**Shri S. C. Samanta** (Tamluk): I beg to move:

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Select Committee on the Bill to provide for regulating the quality of certain seeds for sale, and for matters connected therewith, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be extended upto the last day of the first week of the next Session."

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** (Hoshangabad): Let him give the reasons.

**Shri S. C. Samanta:** I am giving the reasons. The Select Committee formed Study Groups and visited Rajasthan, Uttar Pradesh, part of Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Mysore and Madras. When the Committee was sitting on the 5th of June the members of the Committee and the hon. Minister of Food, Agriculture and Co-operation said that further study should be made as the Bill is so very important for the production of food. So, this permission has been sought. Some hon. Members who were objecting to the extension were telling us that the Government should