

Shri Radhelal Vyas: That is mentioned in rule 376(1).

"A point of order shall relate to the interpretation or enforcement of these rules. . . ."

A point of order can be raised with regard to the enforcement of the rules.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर): उसके अन्तर्गत प्राप प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर नहीं उठा सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: 376 के नीचे कर रहे हैं ?

श्री राजेशलाल व्यास: 376, प्राक्सो टू सब-रूल 2।

Mr. Speaker: Then I cannot permit him because that relates to the business of the House at the moment.

Shri Dwivedy.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: I am raising it under different rules.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. He will excuse me.

Shri Radhelal Vyas: 377, also 197. . .

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

12.24 hrs.

POINT RE: PROCEEDINGS

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Mr. Speaker, the House is aware of the developments yesterday which led some of us to walk out of the House. I am not going to discuss or question the ruling of the Deputy-Speaker who was occupying the Chair then, although I consider that ruling to be in proper. What I am concerned with is. . . .

Mr. Speaker: I cannot sit as a court of appeal. . . .

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Therefore, I am not making any appeal to you against that ruling.

Mr. Speaker: There should be no comments also made on that ruling.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Although I consider it improper, I am not raising that question. . . .

Mr. Speaker: That is a comment. I am asking him not to make it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Friendly comment.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: We are concerned here with the behaviour, manner and the attitude of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Just at this moment?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I am referring to the incident yesterday. If these questions are not clarified in this House, it will not help in conducting the House in an orderly manner. The Chair must also behave. . . .

Mr. Speaker: He will kindly listen to me. If something is to be said about the way the Chair or the presiding officer conducted himself yesterday, then of course it would be out of order because if any Member has got any complaint against the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker, there can only be a substantive motion. His conduct cannot be discussed here in this manner. Only if procedure has to be referred to, he may only refer to that briefly; I only allowed him in those circumstances.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I bow to your ruling. When you give this ruling you have also to remember the responsibility of the Chair under the circumstances in which we are placed here, there the Opposition have practically no opportunity to avail of and to pass a vote of no confidence against the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker. It is a special circumstance. Yesterday that was also referred to. What I am concerned today is this. I want protection and your guidance, the Chair's guidance particularly.**

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair, vide col 7050.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot listen to all this.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: The other point I want to make is....

Mr. Speaker: If he had confined himself to the facts that could be stated here, I would have allowed him, but he is going out of the point and I cannot allow that much.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: If you please permit me . . .

Mr. Speaker: Things that he says here should not be said against the Chair.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I want your guidance.

Mr. Speaker: For guidance, this could not be said.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I want a clear interpretation as to how members should conduct themselves in this House.**

I think I can refer to that.

Mr. Speaker: I have read that, I know what has happened, not only that, but I was listening to all proceedings in my Chamber; I know every word, the sequence and the order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): You could have come.

Mr. Speaker: Really I found it difficult; I purposefully did not come for that notice, for that subject.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I want to refer to your interpretation of rule 372 . . . (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: If reflections are cast on the Chair, I could not allow that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: There is no question of reflection. It is for my own understanding. Rule 372 says

that no questions can be put at the time the minister makes a statement. Now, actually, this is not all that the rule says. Direction No. 119 of the Speaker reads like this:

"A Minister desiring to make a statement in the House under rule 372 shall intimate in advance the date on which the statement is proposed to be made and also send a copy of the statement to the Lok Sabha Secretariat for the information of the Speaker."

Now, we are barred from putting any question, although I was permitted to put a question.

Mr. Speaker: Which Direction is this?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Direction No. 119. In this case the Rules of Procedure were cited, that we can not put questions and that at the time of making the statement no question shall be put. This rule was interpreted against us, Members. But I saw that the particular statement was not submitted to the Secretariat before, but the Minister laid that statement on the Table of the House after he made the statement.

**then he would not have permitted the Home Minister at all to make that statement since he had failed to submit a copy to the Lok Sabha Secretariat before he made that statement here. So far as the aspect is concerned, he completely ignored it, but when it came to the matter of putting questions, then only he asked us not to do anything. Here also there is a convention, regular convention, in this House. The rule says that at the time of making the statement one shall not put questions, but it has been held by you,—and with your permission it has been done,—that on every occasion, it is not at the time of making the statement but after the statement is made, questions are permitted.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair, vide col. 7050

[Shri Surendranath Dwivedy]

sometimes immediately after and sometimes you rule "let the Members go through the statement and I will permit them to put questions later on." This practice is prevailing in this House and to the satisfaction of all concerned, because important statements are sometimes made in the House wherein it becomes necessary that others also should say something to get clarification on the points because it affects the country.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): That is the established practice.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That is the established practice. In this case, the Deputy-Speaker who was in the Chair knew all this practice. If it was his desire that, since the Government was not in a position to clarify any of the questions that may be raised, he should have told us earlier, that could be done as had been done on previous occasions by you: sometimes you also appealed to the Members saying "this is a very complicated affair and so let not Members put any questions now". But in this case nothing was said like that. The Chair only drew attention to rule 372 and said that the rule says so and so and that he cannot permit questions. Only when it was insisted, he said only two or three questions can be put, and some Members objected to it and asked why only two or three questions and under what criterion can he do that. Then it was said it was his discretion. Then several Members got up. I want specifically to draw your attention to that part of the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: I know that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: When we got up, he asked all of us to sit down, and then Shri P. K. Deo said, "You called me, I was on my legs."

Then the Deputy-Speaker said, "Order, order. One at a time." It was said that there was no permission given to me. I got up and put a question. He intervened and said

that "we are not concerned with that now." Again he intervened and said "He has said that." So it goes on. When actually, after the question was put it was pointed out in the House that answers should be given. Instead of permitting answers to be given, he again went back to the previous appeal and showing or quoting the rules said "No. No." He said that "I did not permit." It was not a fact as borne out by the proceedings of the House which I read out. It was repeatedly stated here by my friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee and others that it is on record and the questions had gone on record—

Mr. Speaker: Kindly allow me to say a few words. There ought not to be further discussion raised on this matter. If he allows me to say a few words, I shall.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Certainly. The main question that has to be decided is whether the rules can be interpreted in a manner to suit the convenience of the Government whenever Chair wants to do it in that manner. You should clarify it.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members will bear with me for a short while. There is one question first that the Deputy-Speaker was in the Chair; a point arose; he just quoted the rules and disallowed the questions. There is no authority with me or anybody else to question what has been done by the Presiding Officer.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He allowed it and then disallowed it. That is the anomaly.

Mr. Speaker: Even then, I am not a court of appeal that I can entertain any of those allegations so far as that is concerned.

There comes another question. Mr. Dwivedy wanted to say that this is the interpretation of rule 372. So far

as what occurred yesterday is concerned, the interpretation that was put by the Deputy-Speaker at that time is final and there is no re-opening of it. That finishes yesterday's matter.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Rule 377 does allow that.

Shri Ranga: Under similar circumstances, shall we be helpless? According to your own interpretation, we cannot question it.

Mr. Speaker: Don't be impatient.

Shri Ranga: For years this has been the practice that the Chair's ruling cannot be opened. Either you lay down some definite guidance which will be binding on every occupant of the Chair or we are completely helpless.

Mr. Speaker: It is very unfortunate that before hearing me . . .

Shri Ranga: We are entitled to draw your attention to it again and again until we get proper guidance which will be binding on all the occupants of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: Then I would not give any lessons now. The matter is finished. It is not necessary for me to reopen it.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

Mr. Speaker: If I want to say anything, I am not allowed.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं है ।

Mr. Speaker: What is it that the member wants to say, I do not understand. So far as the practice is concerned, this is correct that we have been allowing certain questions by way of elucidation. There is no doubt about it and we would not depart from it. So far as the rule is

concerned, it is correct. But I think the power can be taken under rule 389 which says:

All matters not specifically provided for in these rules and all questions relating to the detailed working of these rules shall be "regulated . . ." etc.

Therefore, we have been allowing some elucidation. At certain times the Chair has to exercise discretion in that matter.

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) कून बना दीजिये । डाइरेक्टिव दे दीजिये ।

Mr. Speaker: That practice has been there; we are not going to abrogate or discontinue that. But members also must realise that the rule is there and if there is some occasion when questions are not allowed or it is considered that in the interests of the nation, questions should not be allowed at that moment . . .

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Do you think we will put questions which will go against the nation? Why this assumption?

Mr. Speaker: After all, opinions might differ. I am taking it for the sake of illustration. I do not say that any questions that were intended to be put yesterday were against the interests of the nation. But the Home Minister at that time also observed that the Cabinet had taken a decision . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Not at that time, but it was an after-thought.

Mr. Speaker: May be; but I heard him say that the Cabinet had taken a decision just a few hours or minutes earlier—I do not remember and therefore he was not prepared to answer any questions at that moment.

An hon. Member: After the "walk-out" he said that.

Mr. Speaker: So far as yesterday's matter is concerned, that remains closed, because I cannot help it. So far as the future is concerned, of course. . . .

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): Before you say something about the future, Sir, kindly hear us also. फ्यूचर के बारे में कोई व्यवस्था देने के पहले हमारी भी सुन लीजिए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अच्छा, मधु लिमये का प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर पहले सुन लें ।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा जो व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है वह 376(2) के अन्दर है । मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस वक्त जो वर्तमान नियम हैं और कई मामलों में सदन की जो परिपाटी है, "यूसेज ऐंड प्रैक्टिस" उसमें टकराव होता है । आपने पूछा कि क्या इलाज है ? तो मैं इलाज बताता हूँ विनम्रता के साथ कि सदन नेता कांग्रेस पार्टी के चेतक हैं और विरोधी दलों के जो नेता हैं उनको बुलायें । इन नियमों में परिवर्तन करने के लिये एक सम्मेलन बुलाया जाय । मैंने 30 तर्कों में संशोधन दिये हैं । हो सकता है कि उन में से कुछ पसन्द न आयें । मेरा यह अग्रार्ग नहीं कि सभी मान लिये जायें । लेकिन चूँकि हमारे यूसेज ऐंड प्रैक्टिस और नियमों की भाषा में टकराव पैदा होता है जैसे 197 अध्यक्ष महोदय आप देख लीजिए कालिग अट्रेंशन का है, उसके बारे में आप प्रश्न पूछने देने हैं जब कि नियमों में यह नहीं है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अच्छा तो वह रूल्स कमेटी के सामने जायगा

श्री मधु लिमये : आपने कहा कि क्या इलाज है तो इलाज यह नहीं है कि अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव लाया जाय । इलाज यह है कि जो कार्य-पद्धति है उसमें सदन की परिपाटी परभर्रा और व्यवस्था को देखते हुए हम परिवर्तन करें । इतना ही मेरा निवेदन है ।

श्री राधे लाल व्यास : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने अभी रूल 372 के अनुसार कुछ बातें हमारे सामने रखीं । एक तो यह कि एक ऐसा कन्वेंशन हो रहा है प्रैक्टिस रही है कि किसी स्टेटमेंट के बाद में प्रश्न पूछने की इजाजत दी जाती रही है लेकिन मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँगा कि अगर रूल बिलकुल साफ है कि ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए तो क्या ऐसी प्रैक्टिस अगर हमारी गलती से या हमने उधर गौर नहीं किया और ऐसी प्रैक्टिस अगर कायम हो गई कि जिसमें रूल भंग होता हो तो क्या प्रैक्टिस को प्रेफरेंस मिलेगी या रूल माना जायगा ?

श्री मधु लिमये : यह पहले नहीं उठाया ?

श्री राधे लाल व्यास : पहले कभी मौका नहीं आया । अब आया तो मैं उठा रहा हूँ । इसमें जो शब्द हैं श्री द्विवेदी साहब ने जिस तरह से कहा वैसे शब्द नहीं हैं । मैं इसको पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ :

"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."

आपने कैन बी कहा था ।

श्री सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी : आपने सुना नहीं ।

श्री राधे लाल व्यास : मैंने खूब अच्छी तरह से सुना (व्यवधान)

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रोसीडिंग्स पढ़ी जाय । (व्यवधान)

श्री राधे लाल व्यास : आप प्रोसीडिंग्स पढ़ लीजिये । (व्यवधान)
खैर । आपने जैन कहा तो कोई बात नहीं । (व्यवधान) नहीं उन्होंने कैन पढ़ा था भाई साहब माफ कीजिएगा । (व्यवधान) . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर आर्डर ।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय यह गलत आरोप क्यों लगा रहे हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह कायदा नहीं है कि हर एक जगह से जहाँ बैठे हैं वहीं से हर एक कहता रहे । कुछ तो नियमों के मुताबिक चलना चाहिए ।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : अब 'at the time the statement is made' इसके मानी यह नहीं है कि स्टेटमेंट के वक्त कोई खड़ा हो जाय और सवाल कर ले उसके दरमियान में । ऐसा मतलब नहीं है । . . . (अवधान) सुन लीजिए । मुझे कहने तो दीजिए । आपको फिर मौका मिलेगा । रोज मिलता रहता है ।

मैं आपका ध्यान रूज 197 की तरफ भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ जो कि कालिग अटेंशन टु मैटर्स आफ अजेंट पब्लिक इम्पार्टिस के बारे में है उसमें सब-रूज (2) में है :

"There shall be no debate on such statement at the time it is made."

तो क्या इसका मतलब यह है कि उस वक्त में डिबेट भी शुरू हो जायगी और आप एलाऊ करेंगे? एट दि टाइम का मतलब यह है कि जिस समय स्टेटमेंट किया जायगा या वह आर्डर पेपर पर है उस समय से मतलब है और उसके माने यह है कि आर्डर पेपर पर जिस समय वह स्टेटमेंट किया जाता है वह खत्म हो जाय वह भी एट दि टाइम ही माना जायगा और दूसरा बिजनेस जो आर्डर पेपर पर है वह शुरू होने के पहले तक का सब टाइम एट दि टाइम माना जाएगा । यह नहीं हो सकता कि एट दि टाइम के मतलब लास्ट सेंटेंस और लास्ट वर्ड जब खत्म हो उसके पहले के टाइम से हो ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने समझ लिया । मिस्टर माधुर । अब एक एक करके ही मैं बुला सकता हूँ ।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I want to make it perfectly clear that my observations and remarks have got no reference whatsoever to individuals, they are based on principals and rules and therefore nobody need take them as touching somebody individually.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to know, in the first place, is under what provision you have permitted Shri Surendranath Dwivedy, my very esteemed friend.....

Shri Madhu Limaye: Rule 377.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I just want to know that so that my observations may be contained within that. I want to know under what provision you permitted Shri Dwivedy to take up this matter before the House and make all the observations which he did, so that I may make my further observations.

Mr. Speaker: Under my inherent power. (Interruptions).

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It was not under any rule. That is perfectly all right. I quite understand that. It was not under rule 377 or any rule, but it was under your inherent powers that you permitted him to make these observations. I have nothing to say on that. You did it under your inherent powers, so that we can also take advantage of your inherent powers. That is the only thing I want to say, that it was not under any provision or any rule but it was only under your inherent powers, apart from all the rules, that a business which is not covered by any rules was permitted, under your inherent powers, to be taken up on the floor of this House. I have nothing to say on that.

श्री मधु लिमये : 377 के नीचे नहीं लिया है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर आर्डर ।

श्री मधु लिमये : हम भी तो जानना चाहते हैं

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब वह कह तो रहा है जिनके नीचे है । अब आप भी तो सुनिए ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं तो सोच रहा था कि 377 के नीचे पूरा अधिकार है आपको ।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Most of my esteemed friend's observations were directed against the conduct of the Deputy-Speaker yesterday, and certain disparaging observations were made against the conduct of the Chair.

Shri Bade (Khargone): That was resented to.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: It is not a question of being resented to. You yourself observed, Sir, that they were not very relevant. I do not know what permission you gave to him. His entire observations, at least 80 per cent to 90 per cent of his observations, were only regarding the conduct of the Deputy-Speaker and the way in which he conducted the proceedings yesterday. May I know whether you would like all those observations to be expunged from the proceedings of the House or you permitted Shri Dwivedy, under your inherent powers, to deal with that matter and you permit this thing to be here on the records. My esteemed friend also said that the only thing they could do was to seek your protection. He wanted to seek your protection and he said that because they are in a very difficult position, in the position in which they are at present, they cannot bring a substantive motion of censure against the Speaker or the Deputy-Speaker. Yesterday, Sir, all the parties possibly walked out. I think it requires only fifty hon. Members to bring in a substantive motion of censure against the Deputy-Speaker or the Speaker.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What about passing?

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: There is no question of passing. Every day you bring in adjournment motions against the Government. You also bring in no-confidence motions against the Government. Then, why take protection from the Speaker. If all the parties feel like this they can bring in a motion of censure against the Deputy Speaker or the Speaker. If they feel like that they can do so. Therefore, they have a remedy upon to them. There is no need of any protection from you in this matter. I would, therefore, plead that observations made by my hon. friend, on that account, should be withdrawn from the proceedings of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one more observation that I wish to make. Yesterday, when the proceedings were going on the Deputy-Speaker said that he will allow two or three questions, and it was I who rose in my seat to tell him that he should take note of one fact—I did not ask him not to permit questions, because I am never for that—if he permitted questions, it will not be limited to two or three—I wanted to know who those chosen two or three were—and he will have to allow questions to be put by as many Members as he considered to be desirous of putting questions. It is not that you will permit all the 500 Members to ask questions.

Mr. Speaker: He said that once it is open all the members shall have the right.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: He will have to permit those who stand on their seats and have a valid point to make. Therefore, I raised this question, knowing full well that under the rules there is no provision under which such questions can be asked, but because there is a general convention all these questions are asked. I never wanted to take any initiative to stop that convention which gives

a right to the members to raise certain issues. But this definitely creates a great difficulty both for the Speaker as well as for us. Therefore, I appeal to you, please, for God's sake, for future you take into consideration what is going to be the procedure when such statements are made and a few Members want to ask some questions. If you want to amend this rule, please amend the rule. If you do not want to amend the rule, you must stick to the rule.

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : अभी आप ने जो बताया कि इनहेरेंट पावर्स के मातहत इजाजत की तो उस के मुताल्लिक . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वकत कोई प्वाएंश और आर्डर नहीं है। मैं आप को इजाजत नहीं दे सकता।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : आप सुन तो लीजिये . . .

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: We do not want any argument. He said he should be removed. That is not the remedy. He can argue, he can present before you. . . .

Mr. Speaker: Shri Mathur would realise that if we cannot allow a person to speak here. . . .

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I never disputed that.

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : रूल 377 में यह साफ कहा हुआ है :

"A member who wishes to bring to the notice of the House any matter which is not a point of order shall give notice to the Secretary in writing. . . ."

श्री सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी : चिट्ठी लिखी हुई है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरे पास उन की चिट्ठी यह मौजूद है।

Shri Radhela! Vyas: I am sorry; I withdraw my complaint.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इनहेरेंट पावर्स के मातहत क्या मैं किसी को इजाजत नहीं दे सकता ? मैं इस पर क्या फैसला दूँ ?

Shri Radhela! Vyas: It was not under the inherent powers but under rule 377.

Mr. Speaker: Besides rule 377, I have got the inherent powers. अब मैं नहीं समझता कि उस में क्या ऐतराज है अगर मैं कहूँ कि मैं इनहेरेंट पावर्स में ले रहा हूँ ?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that our friend, Shri Mathur has made certain observations rather gratuitously. He has said that the weapon of the censure motion against the Chair is open to us and we could exercise it. The position is that it is farthest from our intention to think of having to move a vote of censure against the Chair. Yesterday, that happened was the Deputy-Speaker himself made a reference to that. We never wanted to make that suggestion at all. Now, it is not very healthy. . . .

Mr. Speaker: Shri Mathur's reference was to the observations made by Shri Surendranath Dwivedi today.

Shri Banga: He made it worse by that observation.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am sure you have understood the reality of what happened yesterday, when we were constrained to walk out in conditions which were not of our making. We had listened to a statement of public interest and some of us did not even want to ask questions but some of us wanted a little clarification.

We have no personal animus against whoever is in the Chair on your behalf, whether it is the Deputy-

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Speaker or the other members of the Panel of Chairmen. We do not wish to be constrained to have to be told that we have the weapon of the censure motion against the Chair and that sort of thing, because we only wanted an opportunity for a discussion.

Now that you have stated that in your discretion you have previously amplified the ambit of the rule to provide questions to be asked when statements of the nature of yesterday's statements are made before the House, we take it from what you have said a reasonable interpretation of that would be, that the salutary practice which is continued for so long would not be stopped at a particular point of time to the detriment of the debate as it took place yesterday and that in future we shall find that we shall be able to ask questions and clarifications on the statement made by the Minister. I do not want it to be a rigid rule. I know that it is in your discretion. But that discretion has been exercised in a manner which is not healthy and it may be quoted as a sort of precedent and that is why we wish to make sure about it.

Mr. Speaker: I must make it clear that it is a discretion which can be exercised by the presiding officer. I have also made it clear that the rule, as it stands, empowers the Chair at times not to permit questions being asked.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very sorry to state that what happened yesterday is contrary to all established practices . . . (Interruptions). I was a victim of the . . .

Mr. Speaker: I would rather like the objectionable portions to be expunged. I think the House would agree to this . . . (Interruptions).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: What are those objectionable words?

Shri Ranga: Are we all speaking without any sense of reasoning? No less a person than the Leader of one of the groups here and my friend, Shri P. K. Deo who was acting for me on behalf of my party, said these things to be straightway expunged by you without even. . .

Shri P. K. Deo: What are the objectionable words?

Shri Ranga: Yesterday's proceedings say. . .

Mr. Speaker: I am talking of the references and reflections made today.

Shri P. K. Deo: May I point out. . .

Mr. Speaker: He would not listen to me.

Shri P. K. Deo: I am stating facts.

Mr. Speaker: No. I am referring to the reflections made today by Shri Surendranath Dwivedy against the Deputy-Speaker. Though he might have done it inadvertently, he might not have intended them, those words that cast aspersions or reflections they might not remain in record I am not talking of what happened yesterday.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: May I humbly submit that I have made it perfectly clear that this is not a personal reflection. After saying that, when this is on record I do not think there is any harm. When you pointed this out, I said that there is no personal reflection and that I was only pointing out facts that happened yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: I will go through the records and if there is anything objectionable I shall certainly remove that portion.*

Shri P. K. Deo: Yesterday I was a victim of the entire episode. The Deputy-Speaker called me and I was going to put the question. I was going to welcome the statement. I wanted certain clarifications. At the

*For expunctions please see cols. 7040 and 7041.

time of going to put the question, like jack-in-the-box, Shri Mathur gets up.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. That is very objectionable.

Shri P. K. Deo: . . . and says that it should not be allowed.

Mr. Speaker: I would not allow that expression. Would he kindly withdraw it?

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह 'जैक इन दी बॉक्स' के बारे में क्या हुआ ? यह तो श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने भी कहा था ।

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: I do not mind it, if it gives satisfaction to my Hon'ble friend.

Mr. Speaker: No, I cannot permit it.

Shri P. K. Deo: Sir, I beg to withdraw those words. I think it is quite parliamentary. He asked me to put some questions. I was going to ask the question. I do not challenge the interpretation of the rule or the Speaker's or Chair's specific powers in that regard. I was going to bow to the ruling and put the question. In the mean time, there was an interruption and ultimately the Deputy-Speaker did not allow me to put the question. Under these circumstances, there was no other alternative for me but to stage a walk out.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I would not allow further debate on that . . . (*Interruptions*).

13 hrs.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Why was a copy not made available to you?

Mr. Speaker: In regard to that also, I would tell the ministers that they should be careful in seeing that an advance copy should be sent to the Chair, whenever a statement is made. Ordinarily I am supplied with a copy,

but this time it was not supplied to me.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: That is my point. The rule has been violated so far as the Chair is concerned. . . (*Interruption*).

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, 'जैक इन दि बॉक्स का क्या हुआ ? ये शब्द जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने राज्य सभा में इस्तेमाल किये थे । क्या आपने उन को हटा दिया है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं हटाया गया है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : बहुत अच्छा है ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: By your leave, Sir, rule 380 dealing with the matter of expunctions says that only words which are either unparliamentary, defamatory, indecent or undignified can be expunged; so it does not fall within the ambit of this rule at all.

Mr. Speaker: Again I have to resort to those powers that I have got.

13.01 hrs.

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966*

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri L. N. Mishra): Sir, on behalf of Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1965-66.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1965-66."

The motion was adopted.

*Published in Gazette of India Extra ordinary, Part II, section 2, dated. 22-3-66.