

(iii) The duration of training should be about 6 months.

(iv) The content of training should include adult psychology, culture and history of the community; methods of planning and evaluation; techniques and teaching methods; field experience; use of instructional material.

(b) *Research and Evaluation:*

(i) Universities should place emphasis on action research e.g., pilot projects, experimental approaches, preparation of vocabularies etc.

(ii) Research should include evaluation.

(c) *Publications:*

These would include:—

(i) Manuals for literacy teachers and administrators.

(ii) Model literature material.

(iii) Graded reading material for continuing and functional education.

(iv) Graded supplementary material.

(v) Annotated bibliographies of adult literacy literature.

(c) The report is under examination.

12.14 hrs.

RE: BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: I have received this intimation from the Home Minister that he would make a statement giving information on the Delhi incidents because that was being asked for. That would be done at 5.30 today.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Which Home Minister? That intimation has been signed by whom?

Mr. Speaker: Shri Jaisukh Lal Hathi.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Not the senior Minister? (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: I have told that Shri Jaisukh Lal Hathi has signed it (*Interruption*).

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): Is he the present Home Minister?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. When I am speaking nobody else should speak. It is a wrong thing.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How has he signed it, as Minister of State or Home Minister?

Mr. Speaker: He has signed "Jaisukh Lal Hathi".

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Not by designation, by name only.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May I know whether Shri Nanda is keeping well? Why is he not making that statement?

Shri Nambiar: He has already resigned or he is likely to resign?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I have also asked the Minister of Health to make a statement on the nurses' strike and she would be making that statement at 5.45 P.M. to day.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

श्री मधु लिये (मुंनेर): मेरा एक व्यवस्था सम्बन्धी प्रश्न है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: इस तरीके से चार, चार आदमी तो एक साथ मैं नहीं बुला सकता।

श्री बागड़ी: मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: वह सब ठीक है लेकिन मैं चार आदमियों को तो एकलव्य नहीं बुला सकता और जब तक मैं किसी को आइडेंटिफाई न करूँ इस तरह से एक साथ बोलना शुरू कर देना तो उचित नहीं है। श्री बागड़ी।

श्री बागड़ी: प्रखबारों में यह छपा है और रेडियो से यह खबर आई है कि श्री नन्दा

का इस्तीफा मंजूर हो गया है लेकिन जबकि सदन चल रहा हो तो इस बारे में सदन के अन्दर पहले इत्तिला न दे कर के बाहर इस बात को चला देना यह सदन का अपमान है। बार बार यहां सदन में यह बात कही जाती आई है। इसके अलावा और दो मंत्रियों के बारे में भी इस्तीफे का आम जिक्र है, श्री शचीन्द्र चौधरी और श्री मनुभाई शाह के बारे में तो मेरा कहना है कि इस तरह से सदन को गुमराह न किया जाये और उस का अपमान न किया जाये और जब सदन चल रहा हो तो सब से पहले सदन को यह सब बतलाया जाये यह मेरी आप से विनती है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यूं तो ऐसी बातों में सदन का अक्षय लेना कुछ उचित नहीं मालूम पड़ता क्योंकि अफवाहों से हमें कोई वास्ता नहीं होना चाहिये।

श्री बागड़ी : नन्दा साहब का इस्तीफा मंजूर हो गया है यह अखबारों में और रेडियो में आ गया है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री हरि विष्णु कामत।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): It has come in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker: The House should not concern itself with what appears in the newspapers.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, I rise on a point of order under the proviso to sub-rule (2) of rule 376, about the arrangement of the business of the House. After some struggle yesterday, we have been successful in getting the first Calling Attention Notice on the agenda paper today. But I find a curious foot-note that it is to be taken up at 6 O'Clock this afternoon.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): It is always done.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalappuzha): No.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Now, may I invite your attention to rule 197 read with the amended rules regarding the arrangement of business amended only last session or the session before that? I will read rule 197 first, Sub-rule (1) says:

“A member may, with the previous permission of the Speaker,”

—that is already secured, because it is in the Order Paper—

“call the attention of a Minister to any matter of urgent public importance and the Minister may make a brief statement or ask for time to make a statement at a later hour or date.”

The last sub-rule of that rule says:

“The proposed matter shall be raised after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon and at no other time during the sitting of the House.”

Please mark the words “at no other time during the sitting of the House” Now, it has happened in the past. I do concede, that whenever 2 or 3 calling attention notices were given, you, Sir, in your wisdom which is never questioned in the House, ordained that the second one may be taken up later on in the evening, say, 6 O'Clock. Well and good; we did not question it at all. Today, after waiting for a week, प्रतीक्षा में आनन्द है— we had waited for a week—we have got this calling attention notice.

Mr. Speaker: I said yesterday that I called the Minister....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, this House, after all, is the mirror of the aspirations of the people, the instrument of the will of the people,

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

and I do hope you will have some patience with us of the opposition, as with the members of the Congress Party. Now, you said yesterday that you had sent this to the Minister concerned, but we were under the impression, may be a wrong impression—because we are not infallible—that it would be taken up today morning. You have told us in the last session, or the session before that, that a Minister is usually given two or three days to make a statement, whether he accepts it or not. We waited and waited for 8 days now and we are happy that it has at least been reached. Under this rule, read with the amended rule with regard to the arrangement of the business of the House, how does it read? First of all, oath or affirmation, then obituary references, then questions (including short notice questions) and then, immediately after that, calling attention notices. This rule makes it mandatory that, unless the Speaker is satisfied and unless there are convincing reasons to the contrary, the calling attention notice that is on the Order Paper, that is, the first one if not the subsequent one, must be taken up after questions and before the regular business is entered upon.

An hon. Member: No.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Do not just say, "No". Listen and then think about it, if you can.

Then, sub-rule (1) says that the Minister may ask for time. That is all right. The Minister is present there. He is sitting there as large as life. Has he asked for time? We do not know. If he has written to you a private letter, it is another matter. If he has asked for time, we are completely in the dark about that. But usually the convention or tradition has been that you call the Member concerned, he reads out the calling attention notice and the Minister asks for time. Almost everyone has asked for time in the past. I

know that. If he asks for time, we have no objection. But today in the Order Paper itself the footnote says.....

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Even then the Speaker must be satisfied.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: For everything the Speaker has to be satisfied. We cannot do anything if he is not satisfied. That goes without saying.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): He does not look very satisfied.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: My colleague, Shri Nath Pai, says that you do not look satisfied about this matter at all. I do not know; I do not presume anything about it.

Without the Minister asking for time publicly, in the House, the business has been so listed that this is to be taken up at 6 O'Clock in the evening. The rules are all in consonance with article 118, clause (1), of the Constitution and the Rules Committee is the sole authority, so far as this House is concerned, to recommend changes in the rules. If there has been a change in this rule, rule 197, the Rules Committee should have recommended that rule and it should have been published in the bulletin concerned. I have scanned all the bulletins in the last few days one after another, but no change in the rule has been notified in the bulletin so far.

Now, what happened yesterday? It is a sad commentary on the ugly disarray in the ranks of the Government party (*Laughter*).

An hon. Member: Yes, Why laugh?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Hardly had the words that had fallen from, the assurance given by, the Leader of the House disappeared into thin air when there was no quorum in the House. Here is the record. At 16.48 hours my gallant friend, Shri Radhelal Vyas had the honour....

An hon. Member: All honour to him!

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: A member of the Congress Party had the guts to rise on a point of quorum. Shri Radhela Vyas said:—

“There is no quorum in the House.”

A very good statement he made.

The Minister of State in the Departments of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Jagannatha Rao): Please read also the earlier statement of Shri Radhela Vyas.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That you read for me. I am not going to read that and waste the time of the House. He is asking me to waste the time of the House. Let him read it.

I am glad the reporters mark the time also; otherwise, we would not have known the time. At 16.48 what happens? You were not there unfortunately, but some Chairman was there. The Chairman says:—

“The bell is being rung—Still”,

he says—he must have had a little pang in his heart perhaps—

“Still there is no quorum”

Then what happens? Then, he says—another direction from the Chair—

“The bell may be rung a second time”.

Look at the disarray in the ranks of the Congress Party! The Leader of the House gave us a solemn assurance in your Chamber and then in the House that at 6 O’Clock and afterwards they will ensure the quorum because they have come before the House to change these rules. But what happens? Again, the Chairman says:—

“The second bell has been rung and still there is no quorum.”

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): For whom the bell tolls?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What a pathetic confession or admission, “...and still there is no quorum. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.”?

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास): जो साधु मरे थे सब लोग उन के रंज में थे ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Even today in the morning there was no quorum.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: To sum up, I would briefly say this. I would plead with you, because you are the supreme custodian of the rights, the liberties and the privileges of this House, if you fail us, Parliament will fail. But knowing you so well, as I do, I am confident that you will not fail. This listing of the business at 6 O’Clock today.....

Shri Tyagi: How many points? (Interruptions)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Please keep quiet.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : पहले सुन लो उस के बाद बोलो ।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You have kept quiet after Tashkent. This footnote, I venture to submit, could not have been done with the whole-hearted concurrence of those who are concerned at the highest level here. I venture to suggest that it is a clumsy ruse, if not a dirty trick, on the part of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Knowing you well, I am confident that you will not be a party to this dirty trick. It is a ruse on the House. I hope this matter will be taken up now.

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing so extra-ordinary as should be emphasized in this manner, as has been done by the hon. Member....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Why not? It is very important. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Hear me.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: This is a dirty trick planned by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and not you... (*Interruptions*)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Ask him to keep quiet.

श्री वृकम चन्द्र कश्यप : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सरकार के दबाव से कानून का उल्लंघन नहीं होना चाहिये ।

Mr. Speaker: I had said yesterday that I had sent the Call Attention notice to the Minister for information. It must be made clear first that I do not ask for his permission or concurrence. It is only the information that I want to get before I decide it. I was inclined to accept and, therefore, I had asked him to give some information about it. I have also ruled that if I do not get information within 48 hours, I will be obliged to put it on the list. Because I had not got that reply, I had to put it on the list and I...

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What is the question of shame?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: They do not heed your advice. And what is all this coming to? Let them all get out. (*Interruptions*)

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): It is very unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Kamath has read the amended rules and he himself quoted them. They are not amended rules. They are rather Directions by the Speaker about the precedence that the business shall have and there it is put down definitely, "unless the Speaker otherwise directs." Therefore, there is no wonder if I have concurred and I have myself put it at 6 O'Clock. Then again....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You take the entire blame on you.

Mr. Speaker: May be. Then again, rather I left an opportunity for the Opposition that there might be some Call Attention notice that might come up today. Here is the Minister asking for time that he will answer it at 5.45 P.M. I have read it and the House knows it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Minister asked for time.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He had eight days.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has asked for time that she would be able to make that statement and answer the Call Attention notice at 5.45 P.M. I read that just now to the House.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In this case, the Minister has not asked for time.

Mr. Speaker: Then again, I say that that was an addition. I rather left an opportunity for the Opposition that I have given.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me...

Mr. Speaker: As regards the calling-attention-notice about nurses, I have announced that that would be taken up; the hon. Minister has asked for time up to 4.45 P.M. and she will be making a statement....

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear my submission...

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): This question was about the calling-attention-notice on the question of scarcity conditions in UP and Bihar, this had been given on the first day and on the second day and repeatedly. Yesterday also you had given it to the Minister saying....

Mr. Speaker: There also, the hon. Member should realise that for four days we had been discussing the No-confidence Motion.

श्री मधु लिमये : नौं दिन से ज्यादा हो गए हैं।

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I do not know why the Minister has not been ready with an answer today.

श्री मधु लिमये : ध्यानाकर्षण और अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का आपस में क्या सम्बन्ध है ? कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है।

Shri Nath Pal: In the first place, I should like very respectfully to draw your attention to this fact that we would plead with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that the impracticability of his suggestion be taken into consideration, because that is borne out by the fact that it is already past 12.30 P.M.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That has been demolished already.

Shri Nath Pal: In the eagerness to rectify their own past lapses, let him not behave in a manner which sets up a dangerous precedent.

I want to recall to you a very important sanction which you had given. The precedent used to be in this House, till you changed it with the concurrence of Government and the leaders of the Opposition Groups, on every day on every important development or occurrence in the country, an adjournment motion, and there used to be a spate of them every day, and those adjournment motions used to be brought up here. You then made an appeal and suggested that unless there was an extraordinarily important matter you would not allow an adjournment motion. We told you that this was an inherent right. To that you replied like this. This is all in an agreement. You replied that Members would be allowed to table calling-attention notices in place of adjournment motions. We said that the calling-attention-notice would not meet the purpose. You then extended this right and said that questions would be allowed to be asked at the rate of one per each party.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Only signatories could ask.

Shri Nath Pal: First you had said that one question would be allowed for each party, and then you said that chance would be given to the signatories to the notice. This was the clear understanding. This was agreed to by the whole House, and we thus gave away a very important right, namely that of moving adjournment motions. It is at this stage that this is not even allowed to be mentioned. For, what we are today doing is in accordance with a well-established convention which is the result of a deliberate agreement reached with the concurrence of the whole House; it is this today which is in jeopardy. This was the consensus then, and the Speaker gave his sanction to it, and, therefore, it had the authority. And it is that which is being violated now. That brings us into a difficulty especially men like me who temporarily are not able to raise the volume of their voice and claim your attention. I would ask whether the new rule is Spencer reversed in the Lok Sabha in India, namely not survival of the fittest but the survival of the loudest. The Minister of Parliament are Affairs could not get any agreement so far on this question, and I am sure you would bear me out with the help of the Secretariat if necessary, and I think that Shri Satya Narayan 'Singh' or Sinha, unless his memory fails...

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is a 'Simha' a lion.

Shri Nath Pal: I would, therefore, submit that it is in your hands now. We do not want anything except what was clearly understood and what practice has prevailed in the House for long and what has been long enjoyed by this House. An arbitrary and mechanical curtailment and infringement of this well established convention is the thing which is bringing in a new precedent which is not likely to enhance the liberties of the House.

[Shri Nath Pai]

Finally, I want to know whether I am quoting you aright. I want to ask whether this is not in jeopardy..

Shri Tyagi: It is not a debate.

Shri Nath Pai: It is a very important matter.....

Mr. Speaker: There was a debate once on this matter, and there was a debate for a second time when an attempt was made to have the decision rescinded....

Shri A. K. Gopalan: That is not the question, but the question is this. You had just now said that you had written to the Minister and given him notice that within 48 hours he should reply. You did not tell us whether he had replied saying that he wanted time. You did not answer that question and there was no reply to that. That is a very important thing.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: No courtesy even.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: When you have given notice, he would at least say that he wants time and it should not be taken up today.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different thing altogether.

Shri Ranga: It is an important thing, and we are not able to discuss it here. Are we the only people to respect the Chair? Is it not their duty also to respect the Speaker? Why is there a Speaker at all? Let us consider that very important issue. Why do we want a Speaker at all in this House? We want the Speaker to be respected both by the Opposition as well as by Government. Many a time you have drawn our attention to this that we did not behave as well as you thought we should have behaved, and we accepted your judgment. But when it comes to the Ministers, what happens? How many

times have they flouted the directions, the advice, the suggestions made by the Speaker? Should we not have an occasion to take them to task in regard to that particular matter?

Here is a blatant, glaring, disobedience on their part, showing disregard to the Speaker. It is not you we are concerned with; we are concerned with the Speaker. You are there today as Speaker; tommorrow there would be another gentleman there. But we are concerned with the office of Speaker.

What happens? What are the rules? What is the convention here? When the Speaker sends a call attention notice to the Minister, he asks him that within two days, or at the most three days he should be prepared to answer. They do not reply. Then the Speaker again writes to them. They ignore that also.

Mr. Speaker: Again on.

Shri Ranga: All right.

Mr. Speaker: Then I put it on the agenda.

Shri Ranga: What does that mean? It means that they disobey you or you disobey them. You cannot disobey them, because they have got to obey you. That is certain. When they disobey you, what does that mean? You are forced now to enforce the law by yourself as a judge. Instead of being in the position of commanding from them implicit obedience, you are faced with a position in which they do these things in a deliberate manner.

Three days were given to him. He was reminded also—I am sure—and in spite of it, he does not care. He does not care to give a reply to the Speaker. If he had not cared to give a reply to our Secretary, even that would have been a terrible offence. But on top of it, they treat the Speaker in this manner. Do you mean to say that there is no redress at all

in this House and it is not possible to take the Minister to task?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Adding insult to injury!

Shri Ranga: There was another case. There was a Minister who had to answer a short notice question on a particular day. You called him. He would not rise in his seat. It is within your memory—he would not rise. Then you reminded him of his duty. What did he do then? He had the temerity to say that he had no information. Then your secretariat had to remind you and were able to tell him that he knew and the answer was already sent to your office; therefore, it was his duty to answer it. Did he answer it? Did he think it proper to apologise to you and the House? No. But in your generosity—that is the real trouble; you are too generous—you allowed that Minister to go scot-free when he should have been condemned and censured in this House. Never before has a thing like that happened in all the years that I have been in this House.

Therefore, I am not prepared to agree with you when you say 'it is another matter'. We cannot allow these things to go on in this manner, when such things are simply dismissed as being of no consequence.

We find now that these Ministers are really intent on disobeying, disregarding and ignoring the existence of the Speaker here. We must have a clear assurance from Government that they would show some sense of regard to, respect for, and compliance with, your wishes, as we are expected to do. If they do not do it, then as I told them yesterday, and I repeat it today, it only means that they have made up their mind to make short shrift of parliamentarism and democracy in this House.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: There are two points (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: I will call one by one.

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी: मैं अपना प्वाइंट फ्राफ़ आर्डर रज करने के लिये एक घंटे से खड़ा हूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये: मैं भी पायंट फ्राफ़ आर्डर उठाने के लिये कितनी देर से खड़ा हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: यह कोई जरूरी नहीं है कि जो सदस्य खड़ा हो, मुझे उस को बुलाना ही होगा।

श्री मधु लिमये: आप को व्यवस्था के प्रश्न पर सब सदस्यों को बुलाना चाहिए और उन को व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने का अवसर देना चाहिए। मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न कार्य-सूची के बारे में है। मैं शार्ट-नोटिस क्वेश्चन के तुरन्त बाद खड़ा हो गया था, लेकिन अभी तक मुझे नहीं बुलाया गया है। प्राध घंटा हो गया है। मैं कितना धीरज रखूँ ?

Shri Tyagi: I remind you that there is an established practice not only here in other parliaments as well. The opposition or other members have got a right to raise points of order. Of course, they have just to put the point exactly, not to deliver speeches, but when a point of order is raised....

श्री मधु लिमये: यह किन को सीख दे रहे हैं ? हम अपना काम अच्छी तरह जानते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: सीख तो हर एक मेम्बर मुझे देता है। मैं सीखने के लिए तैयार हूँ। दूसरे माननीय सदस्य क्यों घबराते हैं ?

Shri Tyagi: I want to raised one point for your ruling. Points of order are raised and then the Speaker gives his ruling. Unless the Speaker is anxious to collect the reactions of others on that point of order, no debate is permitted. So, if a point of order is raised, immediately after that the Speaker's ruling is given, and the point is immediately finished. So, let not points of order be a matter of regular debate.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं व्यवस्था के प्रश्न को लेकर एक सीधा प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ। संविधान और नियम बनाम अध्यक्षीय निर्णय और परम्परा, इस का फ़ैसला इस सदन में हमेशा के लिये होना चाहिए। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि जब परम्परा और अध्यक्षीय निर्णय कांग्रेस पार्टी के हक में जाता है, तो संविधान और नियमों को ख़त्म कर दिया जाये और जब संविधान तथा नियम कांग्रेस पार्टी के हक में जाते हैं, तो परम्परा को ख़त्म कर दिया जाये। इस बात को अब बर्दाश्त नहीं किया जायेगा। मैं इस बारे में आप का साफ़ निर्णय मांगता हूँ। मैं आप का ध्यान नियम 372 की तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूँ, जो इस प्रकार है :

"A statement may be made by a Minister on a matter of public importance with the consent of the Speaker but no question shall be asked at the time the statement is made."

नियम यह था, लेकिन परम्परा यह थी कि आप मन्त्री के वक्तव्य के बाद प्रश्न पूछने देते थे। उस तरफ़ के सदस्यों ने उस परम्परा के खिलाफ़ आप को अपील की और आप को इस बात के लिए मजबूर किया कि आप सोच-समझ कर, कानूनी पहलुओं को देख कर, नये सिरे से अपना फ़ैसला दें और वह फ़ैसला आपने रिजर्व रखा है। यहाँ पर जो परम्परा बनी थी उसको नियम का आधार लेकर इस प्रकार ख़त्म कर दिया गया।

अब मैं आपका ध्यान संविधान के अनुच्छेद 113 की तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूँ जो अनुदानों की मांगों के बारे में है। वह अनुच्छेद इस प्रकार है :

"So much of the said estimates as relates to the expenditure shall be submitted in the form of demands for grants to the House of the People, and the House of the People shall have power to assent, or to refuse to assent, to any

demand, or to assent to any demand subject to a reduction of the amount specified therein."

अध्यक्ष महोदय: इस वक्त अनुदानों का सवाल नहीं है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आप के सामने सिद्धान्त की बात रख रहा हूँ। आप दूसरे सदस्यों को पंद्रह-पंद्रह मिनट देते हैं मैं केवल षांच मिनट उंगू और उस में एक बात भी फालतू नहीं कहूँगा। मैं सिद्धान्त की बात रख रहा हूँ उस को सुनने के बाद आप अपना फ़ैसला दीजिए। इस का मतलब यह है कि हम कट-मोशन दे सकते हैं। नियम 208, 209 और 210 के मातहत किसी भी अनुदान की मांग पर हम को कट-मोशन देने का अधिकार है—लोक सभा और राज्य सभा के अनुदानों पर भी। लेकिन आप ने इन अनुदानों की मांगों पर हमारे कटीती प्रस्तावों को खारिज किया। किस आधार पर? इस आधार पर कि यहाँ पर परम्परा बन गई है, आप का निर्णय हो चुका है। इस प्रकार संविधान के अनुच्छेद 113 और नियम 208, 209 और 210 को भी ख़त्म कर दिया गया।

अब मैं आप का ध्यान नियम 197(5) की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ, जो कालिग एटेंशन नोटिस के बारे में है। वह नियम इस प्रकार है :

"The proposed matter shall be raised after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon and at no other time during the sitting of the House."

जब कालिग एटेंशन नोटिस के बारे में श्री कामत और हम लोग इस नियम का आग्रह लेते हैं, तो आप कहते हैं कि परम्परा इस के विपरीत है।

इस बारे में मेरा वर्गीकरण तो यह है कि सब से पहले संविधान उस के बाद कानून और

नियम, उस के बाद ग्रह्यश्रीय निर्देश, उस के बाद ग्रह्यश्रीय निर्णय और परम्परा। लेकिन जब संविधान के अनुच्छेद और नियम हमारे हक में जाते हैं, तो उन को खत्म कर दिया जाता है और जब कभी संविधान के अनुच्छेद और नियम उन लोगों के हक में जाते हैं, तो आप परम्परा को खत्म कर देते हैं। मैं हमेशा के लिए आप का फैसला चाहता हूँ कि इस में सार्वभौमिकता किस की मानी जायेगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि एक क्रम बनाया जाये और उस के अनुसार ही सारा काम-काज चले।

ग्रह्यश्री महोदय : यह ठीक है कि सब से पहले संविधान है, उस के बाद कानून और रूज हैं और उस के बाद डायरेक्शन हैं। इस में कोई शक नहीं है। इस में पूछने की क्या बात है? इस हाउस में कभी भी आर्टिकल 113 का भंग नहीं किया गया है।

श्री मधु लिमये : किया गया है।

ग्रह्यश्री होदय : हर एक माननीय सदस्य को इस बात का हक है कि वह किसी भी मिनिस्ट्री के बारे में कट-मोशन दे, लेकिन यह हाउस कौन कट-मोशन डिस्कस करेगा या नहीं, यह इस हाउस की भर्जी है। वह हाउस मिनिस्ट्रीज को चुन लेता है कि हम फलां फलां मिनिस्ट्रीज पर डिस्कशन करेंगे और फलां फलां पर नहीं करेंगे।

श्री मधु लिमये : पंद्रह साल में एक दफा तो लोक सभा और राज्य सभा की लेते। रूल 208, 209 और 210 के अनुसार हम को अधिकार है कि हम किसी भी मंत्रालय के बारे में कटोती-प्रस्ताव दे सकते हैं।

ग्रह्यश्री महोदय : यह हाउस साविरें है। वह फैसला कर सकता है कि वह किन किन मिनिस्ट्रीज को डिस्कस करेगा।

श्री हरि बिष्णु कामत : राज्य सभा की मांगों के बारे में आप ने तीन दिवस पहले जो फरमाया था, उस से धारा 113 का भंग हुआ है।

ग्रह्यश्री महोदय : वह दूसरी बात है।

श्री मधु लिमये : वह दूसरी बात नहीं है वह इसी से जुड़ी हुई बात है।

ग्रह्यश्री महोदय : किस मिनिस्ट्री को देखा जाये और किस को छोड़ दिया जाये, यह फैसला करना इस हाउस का अधिकार है।

श्री मधु लिमये : पंद्रह सालों में लोक सभा और राज्य सभा के अनुदानों में से किसी को नहीं देखा गया है। इस तरह तो आप डिफेंस मंत्रालय की मांगों को भी खत्म कर देंगे।

ग्रह्यश्री महोदय : किसी वक्ता भी कांस्टीट्यूशन के किसी आर्टिकल का भंग नहीं हुआ है। इस बारे में यह हाउस ही हमेशा फैसला करता रहा है।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: On a point of order.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: May I make a submission.

Mr. Speaker: Point of order, Mr. Banerjee has been standing.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : ग्रह्यश्री महोदय, मैं भी बार-बार खड़ा हो रहा हूँ। अगर आप चाहें, तो मैं भी उस को व्यवस्था का प्रश्न कहूँ। आप सब को बुला रहे हैं, लेकिन आप मेरी तरफ भी इनायत कीजिए।

ग्रह्यश्री महोदय : जब सब कह रहे हैं, तो आप भी कह दीजिए। इसी तरह व्यवस्था के प्रश्न बनने हैं।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My point of order is this. Kindly read Direction 2.

Shri Tyagi: How can a point of order be a subject of discussion?

Mr. Speaker: I am not discussing it. He is raising a different point of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: The point is that Mr. Tyagi has not become mature in 15 years, I have become mature in ten years!

श्री मधु लिमये : श्री त्यागी ओवर-मेच्योर हो गए हैं, इसी लिए ऐसा हो रहा है ।

Shri Nambiar: Over-mature!

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Direction 2 says:

"Unless the Speaker otherwise directs the relative precedence of the classes. . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस बारे में कह दिया गया है ।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : आप मेरी बात भी मुन लीजिए । मैं दो मिनट से ज्यादा नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो बात कही जा चुकी है, उस को दोहराना जरूरी नहीं है ।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : मुझे अपनी बात कह लेने दीजिये ।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास (उज्जैन) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य एक एक कर के कहेंगे । वे दो बजे तक इस मामले को चलायेंगे ।

श्री बाजी (इन्दौर) : हम ने कल यही तो कहा था ।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप को इन लोगों को कहना चाहिए कि वे कार्यवाही को डिस्टर्ब न करें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं सब सदस्यों को कहना चाहता हूँ कि यहाँ पर तहम्मूल बहून जरूरी है । एक तो इसी तरफ से मेरे कानों में यह डाला जा रहा है कि साढ़े बारह बज गए हैं. . . .

श्री बागड़ी : साढ़े बारह बजे का कोई विधान नहीं है । वह नहीं चलेगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसी तरफ से मुझे कहा जा रहा है कि साढ़े बारह बज गए हैं. . . .

Shri Nath Pal: It shows only its impracticability.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर उस डिमिशन को वर्क आउट कर के डिमांड्रेट किया जाता कि वह इमप्रैक्टिकेबल है, तो ज्यादा अच्छा होता । अगर उम डिमिशन को इग्नोरमेंट किया जाता, उम डिमिशन का चलने दिया जाता, तो हाउस खुद रोयलाइज़ करता कि वह इमप्रैक्टिकेबल है ।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : हम देख रहे हैं कि वह इमप्रैक्टिकेबल है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : लेकिन वजाये इस के कि उस को एनफोर्स किया जाये और उस पर चलने की कोशिश की जाये, और इस तरह से क्वाटर डाली जा रही है कि कोई काम न चला सके ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is is still born. It will remain a dead letter.

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri C. Subramaniam): After the admonition of the Leader of the Swatantra Party, I am entitled to be heard. I want to say a few words.

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : आप ने कहा समय मांगा उन्होंने . . . (Interruptions)

Just see. Too much of indiscipline.

Mr. Speaker: He should not say like that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Why should he get up and speak like this now, Sir? We are thrown out every day; we do not feel regret. But there is indiscipline to the core there.

Now, Sir, kindly allow me to make my submission.

वो प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है अध्यक्ष महोदय । पहले तो आप ने यह कहा है कि मंत्री महोदय ने समय मांगा था आपसे और इसीलिए आपने 6 बजे का समय रखा । उस के पहले एक बात और कही कि हमारी हेल्थ मिनिस्टर साहिबा 5 बजकर 45 मिनट पर या साढ़े 5 बजे बयान देंगी । तो मैं यह आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेरा नाम बूँक सब से पहले है और मैं ने नोटिस 26-27 अक्टूबर को दिया है, उस वक्त नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन की बात कोई नहीं थी और मंत्री महोदय को अगर 26-27 तारीख से आज तक समय नहीं मिला उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में जो टाउठ की सिचुएशन है उस की जानकारी करने के लिए तो मैं समझता हूँ मुझे आप माफ करें, मैं यह साजिश तो नहीं कहूँगा लेकिन यह ज़रूर कुछ उधर से कोशिश हो रही है कि आप का सहारा लेकर, आपके फंसले का सहारा लेकर इस चीज को ज़तना डिले कर दिया जाय कि हाउस में उस समय कोरम न रहे और यह 30-35 आदमी जिन्होंने कॉलिग ऑटेशन पर दस्तखत किये हैं उन को सवाल पूछने का मौका न मिले ।

दूसरा जो हेल्थ मिनिस्टर का है, उस के बारे में मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप का डाइरेक्शन 47-ए में कॉलिग ऑटेशन के बारे में है । उस में आप ने कॉलिग ऑटेशन तो ऐडमिट नहीं किया लेकिन आप ने यह बात कही कि वह इस पर बयान देंगी । तो जिस वक्त वह बयान देंगी उसी वक्त दीक्षित जी खड़े हो जायेंगे और कहेंगे प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर, कोई सवाल नहीं हो सकता . . .
(ध्यानधान)

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want to submit that ever since Parliament began on the 2nd November, the scarcity conditions in U.P. and Bihar had been agitating the minds of people as well as Members of Parliament. You said that because there was a no-confidence motion, this would not be taken up. We raised

this question even yesterday. After that you sent it to the Minister but the Minister did not even care to reply and then he said that he wanted time because it was very important. It is very very important. How can we go on like this when the Minister does not even say that he wants time and does not even reply to that. We read in the papers that the Prime Minister went to U.P. and Bihar; we have seen reports and also pictures saying that the Prime Minister was sorry about it. We felt that the Prime Minister would have given a statement instead leaving it to the Food Minister to make a statement. This is not only disrespect to the Chair but it is disrespect to the people. They do not care for the people who suffer on account of scarcity conditions in the country. Government has already declared a war on the people.

Mr. Speaker: The position is this.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: 32 Members of Parliament of the Opposition signed that notice but he has cared not to reply.

Mr. Speaker: I have to make the position clear. Probably I had been misunderstood. I did not take up these notices when the no-confidence motion was being discussed. I kept them with me because if some subjects of great public importance were not discussed and replied to, I thought I could consider those notices. So long as that discussion continued, I did not admit any notice. When that was concluded and notices continued to pour in, on the 7th, after the discussion on the no-confidence motion had been concluded, I asked the Minister to give me facts and to tell me whether he would make a statement that was on the 7th. Then, on the 8th, because there was a pressing demand and a reply by that time had not been received, I informed him that I am putting up this motion for the 9th and he will have to answer it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He did not reply.

Mr. Speaker: There was only one day and how could he reply. On the 8th, I sent the direction, that it would be put for the 9th.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: What did he say?

Shri C. Subramaniam: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say at the outset that there was no question of any disrespect to the Chair, even indirectly and if it is felt that there was any disrespect, even indirectly, I would like to apologise to you. But fortunately there is no need to do so as no question of disrespect to you or to the House arises in this instance.... (Interruptions.)

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Government says nothing. Why?

Shri C. Subramaniam: Please hear me; I have to be heard.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We will hear you though we do not tolerate you.

Shri C. Subramaniam: My parliamentary assistant received notice at 8 A.M. yesterday that I should give information about it and we were gathering information. At 3 P.M. again, we were informed that this was being put on the list of business for the 9th, that is, today and therefore I should get ready. Therefore, there is no question of my failure to reply to you within the allotted time of 48 hours. In fact because of the urgency of the matter, you were good enough to say that I should get ready to reply and I am ready and I am prepared to make a statement as directed by you at 6 O'clock. The Leader of the Swatantra Party weaves out a case—one communication, another reminder and so on and in spite of all that I show disrespect to the Chair; I paid scant courtesy to your direction! It is not so and I wish to tell the Professor that I try to observe decorum as much as possible and in this case

there was absolutely no cause for his comments. As far as I am concerned, when you said that I should get ready I have got ready and I am prepared to make a statement at 6 O'clock.

Shri Hem Barua: He is contradicting your statement. You said that the Minister requested you to put down the notice at 5.45.

Mr. Speaker: No, no; the Minister did not say.

Shri C. Subramaniam: I would say to Prof. Ranga that I have not done any thing which is disrespectful to the Chair or to the House.

13 hrs.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम लोग प्रक्रिया की दलदल में फंसे चले जा रहे हैं और असलियत से हट रहे हैं। काम करने के तरीकों और नियमों पर जितना समय इस सदन का बरबाद होता है और जो असलियत है और काम है, उस पर हम अपना ध्यान नहीं दे पाते हैं। इस पर हम सब को गम्भीरता से सोचना चाहिये। आखिर लोक सभा के बाहर जो जो चीजें होती रहती हैं, जो जो काम होते रहते हैं, उन के बारे में हां या ना, कन्नून बनाना, स्वीकारना, त्यागना इन सब के ऊपर अगर लोक सभा नहीं सोचती, विचारती और खाली अपनी नियमों पर इतना ज्यादा सोचने और विचारने लग जाती है, यदि असलियत प्राणों से दूर हो जाय, तो क्या नतीजा होगा? आपने देख लिया कि दिल्ली में क्या हालात हुए, अभी तक हम उस पर कोई बहस नहीं कर पाये हैं। कितने लोग मरे, क्या उन के नाम थे . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय: वह स्टेटमेंट आज प्रा रहा है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह ठीक है। मैं देख रहा हूँ कि यह मुल्क कितना गिर गया है, मोटरों के नाम जानते हैं कि कौनसी बलीं, लेकिन, अध्यक्ष महोदय, . . . (व्यवधान) . . . मेरी बात सुनिये, प्राफ

मोटरोँ के नाम जानते हैं, लेकिन भ्रादमी जो मर गये, उनके नाम नहीं जानते हैं, तीन दिन उनको मरे हुए हो गये हैं। कितने मरे, मैंने सुना है कि 20 मरे हैं, वे कहां जा रहे थे, कुछ नहीं मालूम, इन के ऊपर तीन दिन से यहां लोक सभा में कुछ नहीं हो पाया है। मैं आपको यह बतला देना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह से यहां पर दवाने से यह चीज यहां न फूटकर कहीं और फूट जाया करती है। इसी तरह से भ्रकाल-वाला मामला है। मैं पूरी ताकत से कहना चाहता हूँ कि 40-50 लाख लोग, बल्कि एक करोड़ भ्रादमी इस साल या भ्रगले साल मरने वाले हैं, लेकिन इस के ऊपर लोक सभा का ध्यान नहीं जा पा रहा है, क्योंकि उस बहस को दबाया जा रहा है, भ्रगर इस को यहां पर दबायेंगे तो कहीं न कहीं फूटकर रहेगी।

मुझे भ्रफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है और मैं इस चीज को पसन्द नहीं करता कि इस सरकारी दल के सभापति को अपनी चप्पल को छोड़कर घर से बाहर भागना पड़ा, एक समय ऐसा भी आ सकता है जब आपको और हम को विवस्त्र हो कर भागना पड़े। ये सब ऐसी चीजें हैं, जिन से भ्रगर आप अपनी भ्राखें भ्रोजन कर लेंगे तो नतीजा इस देश में बहुत खतरनाक हो कर र गा . . .

भ्रध्यक्ष महोदय : अब बस कीजिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : भ्रध्यक्ष महोदय, आप थोड़ी सी तसल्ली रखिये, जैसे श्रीरों के साथ रखते हैं, प्रक्रियावालों के साथ रखते हैं, ऐसा ही थोड़ा धीरज भ्रसलियतवालों के साथ भी रखिये, इस में देश का कल्याण होगा।

मैंने कई बार निवेदन किया कि जो भ्रंश्यों के यहां पद्धति है—स्थगन प्रस्ताव लेने की

भ्रध्यक्ष महोदय : आप उस को छोड़ दीजिये। मैंने आपको सुन लिया है, अब बस कीजिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सुन कहां र हैं, बहस को दबा रहे हैं।

भ्रध्यक्ष महोदय : यह बहस किस प्रकार चल रही है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : बहस नियमों पर हो रही है, इस बात को दवाने की कोशिश की जा रही है। इस को यदि आप दबायेंगे, तो यहां से तो दब जायगी, लेकिन कहीं और फूटकर निकलेगी, फिर इन नियमों को आप नहीं बचा पायेंगे। आप देख रहे हैं कि सरकारी दल के सभापति का क्या हाल हुआ, वे भागकर निकले। आप चाहते हैं कि मेरा, आपका, सब का यही हाल हो, भ्रगर आप दबायेंगे तो ऐसा ही होगा।
(अध्वधान) भ्रकाल चण्डिका घूम रही है, उनके ऊपर भी हाथ उठ जाय, आप क्या चाहते हैं ?

भ्रध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप बैठ जायें।

Shri Tyagi: Nothing to be recorded. Do not record.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I want an assurance from you. If history repeats itself, and like yesterday, if there is no quorum again today, I hope this item will not lapse.

Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah): A! that the hon. Member Dr. Lohia said is irrelevant. They should be expunged from the records. There is no point of order in his remarks and what he has said should be expunged. (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us proceed to the next item.