

his legs. Kindly resume your seats. The House is in a disorder. Let us hear him if there is any relevance or otherwise.

..(Interruptions)

SHRI AJOY MUKHOPADYAY: Sir, we are taking our seats.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes, please sit down.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, with your permission, let me submit to you that I understand entirely the Government's mishandling of the situation. The Government is trying to cover up their gross mishandling of a very important issue. If it was a process of consultation that the Government wanted with my friends here or with us, surely, this consultation, the process has not to start almost at the ultimate moment when the Bill is to be voted upon. This is an unprecedented example of the total incapacity and lack of foresight of this Government. That is the first point.

(Mr. Speaker in the chair)

14.42 hrs.

Sir, I was making a submission at the cost of being repetitious. May I just put it to you?

MR. SPEAKER: No. I was here.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I understand it entirely. My sympathies are actually with the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs. I sympathise with his dilemma because he is having to pay a price for the total incompetence of his Government.

Now, if it was a consultation that the Government wanted with us, surely this consultation was not something that they should engage in when the Bill is to be voted upon. After all the hon. Minister was on his legs; he had begun the process of reply and only because the House was then adjourning on account of paucity of time, it was said, 'He will continue tomorrow'. This 'tomorrow' is today and now.

Now, suddenly we are given a List of Supplementary Business and the hon. Minister for Parliamentary Affairs comes and says what you have stated: suspend; take up this now; so that we, the government can cover up our incompetence by interim consultation with you and try and find a way out of an obvious enough difficulty. My submission is that if rules are to be followed, you are the preserver of rules - the Supplementary List is of course, a means by which a supplementary business in the House can be taken up, but the House can take up supplementary work only with the consent of the House. The Government cannot suddenly come to us and give us and impose Supplementary List of Business and say, "do this; do not do what is scheduled or what is already in the process of being done." The Government has to explain its incompetence.

MR. SPEAKER: In fact, I have come here to explain.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, it is the Government that has to explain.

MR. SPEAKER: No. In this case, probably, I have to explain it to the House. This difficulty was explained to me. The Government said that we want to have consultations with other hon. leaders and Members of other Parties.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Consultations about what?

MR. SPEAKER: You wait for a while and let me complete it. The question before us was, what business we should take up in the House. If the Leaders so desire, should we take up discussion on the President's Address? Then, if we take up the discussion on the President's Address, will we be able to complete it, and if we are not able to complete, should we break that discussion? I suggested that we should have a discussion with the Leaders and if the House agrees, only then we should take up the supplementary business. I also suggested to them to circulate the supplementary business because in case the House agrees to it, at that point there will be no time to circulate it. But it was certain that we would take up the supplementary business only if the House agrees to it. So, I have come here to take the responsibility otherwise I would not have come. Hon. Deputy-Speaker was not aware of this fact. So, I have come here.

[Translation]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have just rendered me answerless. When you told me that on behalf of the Government you....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Not on behalf of the Government, the business of the House is going on therefor,

[English]

The point is whether we should take up discussion on the Presidents' Address or not.

[Translation]

SHRI RABI RAY (Kendrapada): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have heard Shri Shukla just now. Now the question is that it is a vital issue. It is the question of the sovereignty of the country, it is the question of the future of the country. My submission is that the Government has had consultation with the political leaders on GATT agreement several times.

Secondly, the Parliament was not taken into confidence before signing the Marrakesh agreement. The Government kept Parliament in the dark and did everything and has now brought this ordinance. Therefore my submission is that the Government is talking about consultation only because it is afraid that it will not be passed here, now because the entire House even the Members of the ruling party, the Congress rose and protested here yesterday. Our submission is that the entire Opposition and many hon. Members from the Congress oppose the basic principles behind issuance of the Ordinance.

I consider it against the Constitution, against the sovereignty of the country and we are losing our sovereign right of taking decision. I, therefore, would like to submit that we will debate on this issue only when the

Government undertakes to withdraw this ordinance.

[English]

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (Hooghly): Sir, our objection to the proposal being made by the hon. Minister is that this Parliament has all along treated this issue very shabbily. In other Parliaments of the world we find that important discussions are taking place and the Members over there are contributing to enrich the new world order and to extract and derive facilities as best as possible in their own interest. But just the reverse is taking place in our case. We describe ourselves as the largest democracy but we find this Parliament is being, all along, deprived to have a full-fledged discussion on this very very important issue.

Even before the Ordinance was promulgated, a large number of M.Ps made an appeal to the hon. President not to promulgate any Ordinance on such an important issue. Even yesterday, we appealed to the Government to withdraw the Ordinance and allow this Parliament to have a full-fledged discussion because the changes being proposed in the amended Bill will have far-reaching consequences for the nation, although it is being said that it is only the first phase. There should not be any hurry. The Parliaments of the world are waiting to see how others bring about changes in their own law to control the demands of WTO. In our case we are doing all these things very clumsily and in a very hurried manner. There is no necessity of it.

My demand is, if you want to postpone it, you should withdraw the Ordinance first and allow the Parliament to have a full-fledged discussion so that the Parliament can have its say on such an important issue.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Sir, more than 100 Members of Parliament submitted a memorandum to the President before the promulgation of this Ordinance. Our apprehension was that the Government would bypass Parliament, promulgate the Ordinance and then come before Parliament with a Bill to replace the Ordinance because we were totally against this action of the Government. We were totally against this procedure through which the Government intended to amend the Patents Act of 1970 and we have expressed our views also. In view of this I would urge upon the Government that they should withdraw the Bill. If they want to have consultation with the Opposition, they can very much do so. Our question is why, was this consultation not held before promulgation of the Ordinance. There was enough time in the month of December for it! They could have held this consultation with the Opposition parties. They could have elicited the opinions of all the political parties. Without doing this, after promulgation of the Ordinance, what consultation remained to be held with the Opposition?

So, at this stage we want this Ordinance to be withdrawn. Let there be consultation first and if there is need for amending the present Act, then that can also be done in consultation with the Opposition, by incorporating their views in the amending Bills. So, we want that the Ordinance be withdrawn forthwith.

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): Speaker, Sir, during the consultation held by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs with the Janta Dal party, we also categorically said that he should withdraw this Ordinance and let the consultation take place. If there is necessity, we can discuss this. But, this kind of *fait accompli* that after promulgating the Ordinance and bringing it before the House you have to pass it, is something which we will not and cannot cooperate with. Therefore, let the Ordinance lapse or you withdraw it and then let there be a full-fledged discussion on it in the House. Thereafter the House can take a view and accordingly the Government can act. This is our position and we urge upon the Government that this Ordinance be withdrawn. Let the Parliament discuss the subject at length and subsequently whatever decision is expressed in the House, the Government should proceed accordingly. Therefore, I demand that the Government should withdraw this ordinance immediately.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Speaker, Sir, while signing the World Trade Organisation document the Government was fully aware of the fact that necessary amendment would have to be brought about in the present rules in India. The Committee system was introduced with your endeavours. In this regard it is noteworthy that a new system has been introduced in the Parliamentary system of the Government. Could the Government not refer it to the committee for a review? The Government has introduced this through an ordinance in a haste. Now the Government does not find its majority in the august House and therefore now it is no more in a haste. The discussion is almost complete on this Bill. The hon. Minister is likely to give reply now. It was a Constitutional Resolution brought without taking all parties into confidence. I think it will not be proper to continue discussion on the Resolution of disapproval and proceed on with this agenda. The Government did not consult the opposition at all while introducing it in the House. I, therefore, request the Government to withdraw it and draft the Bill afresh and present it to the Committee. This should be considered properly and then brought before the august House. Only this much I want to urge upon you.

[English]

SHRI RAM NAIK: Sir, I am on a point of order. Some hon. Members were expressing their views as to what is to be done about the Bill which is under discussion and the Minister was on his legs. This is one aspect. My point of order is about the Supplementary List of Business which has been circulated to the Members. A Bill has been shown in the Supplementary List of Business which has been circulated. This particular Bill which is intended to be discussed has been passed by the Rajya Sabha on 20th of March, viz., only yesterday. Now, for any Bill to be discussed, we are required to give Amendments and for those Amendments we need time, viz., at least two days. This is according to Rules.

About the List of Business, I now invite your attention to Rule 31 Sub-Rule (1) on Page 40. It says;

"A List of business for the day shall be prepared by the Secretary-General, and a copy thereof shall be made available for the use of every member."

That has been done.

Now, about the Supplementary List of Business, actually I do not find any Rule as such but I invite your attention to Rule 31, Sub-Rule (3). It says:

"Save as otherwise provided in these rules, no business requiring notice shall be set down for a day earlier than the day after that on which the period of the notice necessary for that class of business expires."

For giving Amendments to a Bill we are required to give at least two days' notice. Now, we are deprived of that. Whether this Bill will be passed today or not is another aspect. But we have a right that we must be informed in advance that this Bill will be taken into consideration. This Bill requires notice. According to this Agenda we have not been given time.

So, I feel that this Bill cannot be included in the Supplementary List of Business. The best course would be—if the Government is not prepared for this Bill and for any other business—to adjourn. But, this Bill cannot be taken into consideration for want of notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Which Rules says that this Bill cannot be taken into consideration for want of notice?

SHRI RAM NAIK: I will be deprived of my right to move my Amendments, once the discussion starts.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow you to move the Amendments. The Rules have to be interpreted to facilitate the working. You have a right to move your Amendments. You will be able to enjoy that right. I will allow you to move your Amendments.

SHRI RAM NAIK: But, Sir, if the Bill is passed today, then what shall I do?

MR. SPEAKER: It would not be passed today. You can give your Amendments today. They will come up tomorrow. So, you can give them on that account.

SHRI RAM NAIK: It is an important Bill. Without preparation, the quality of the debate will go down further.

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with you that this is not a regular procedure. This is an extraordinary procedure. We would like to adopt this only with the consensus of everybody.

As far as that point is concerned under which you claim to move your Amendments, that is correct. I will allow you to move your Amendments.

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY (Jagatsinghpur): The Parliamentary Affairs Minister's suggesting or feeling that further consultation is necessary is something which itself is questionable. Rather I would say that his very suggestion itself is motivated and

questionable. It is also questionable because when this Bill was introduced, at that time, there was enough time. If the Government had the intention of consulting it with other people, at that time, they could have done it. Having not done it at that time, just three days after the adjournment of Parliament, the Ordinance was issued. Moreover, the Members had also requested the President not to issue the Ordinance. That was not favoured or was not taken into consideration. That shows that the Government was all along bent upon passing the Bill or imposing it on the country. We are passing many legislation. We should pass them. there should not be any difficulty on that score. But the question here is that the Bill is impinging upon our Constitution.

15.00 hrs.

We have taken oath to uphold the Constitution. So, no Government or no party has no right to bring such an ordinance which infringes our Constitutional sovereignty. This is the biggest question which should be taken into consideration. In view of the present Bill, I can opine this much that it infringes our Constitution and our Constitutional rights. To cooperate with the Bill will be something very suicidal for the country and for ourselves. We will not be doing our duty in safeguarding the right that has been given to us.

MR. SPEAKER: Let us come to the point. If you do not want the Bill to be passed, you can vote against it tomorrow.

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY: Sir, the question is.....

MR. SPEAKER: If the Government wants to discuss with you and wants to convince you that there is substance in the Bill and if you are not convinced, well, you can vote against it.

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY: Sir, I have not concluded. You are here not only to protect the Government or the House but also the Constitution. Do not forget your responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: You are just speaking without reading out anything. I will read it out to you.

"that such order of the business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation".

That is one.

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY: I am telling this just to satisfy you. I am only trying to satisfy you that this Bill infringes our Constitutional rights.

MR. SPEAKER: I am satisfied that if you are not convinced you should vote against the Bill.

SHRI LOKANATH CHOUDHURY: The only alternative before the Government is to withdraw the Bill.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (Barrackpore): I draw your attention to the fact that under your auspices the Parliamentary Standing Committee were formed. Firstly,

Before the promulgation of the ordinance the Parliamentary Committee was not consulted. Secondly, before signing of the Marrakech Agreement, the Parliamentary Committee on Commerce discussed the Dunkel draft threadbare; it took evidence of wide range of people, especially the scientists and representatives from science organisations, business organisations and others. After an exhaustive study they have submitted a report where it was clearly mentioned that our Government should not change the process patenting into product patenting on the pressure of some of the member countries of the agreement. I want to draw your attention to the fact that in clear violations of the suggestions of the Committee, the Government had promulgated an ordinance and now taken it up in the form of a Bill. This is a clear violation of the Parliamentary practice. I want to draw your attention to this matter.

I want to draw your attention to this matter and request you to direct the Government to withdraw the Bill. As it stands now, according to the suggestions of the Parliamentary Standing Committee, it should be withdrawn and then let us continue the discussion with the Leaders of the Parties. After the consultation, they can once again come before the Parliament.

MR SPEAKER: Since you are asking me to direct the Government to withdraw it, you please show me the rule under which I can do it.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR: The idea that prompted you is to form these Standing Committees.

MR. SPEAKER: I agree with you. That point is very validly taken. But that is not applicable to an Ordinance.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR: Now, this is a Bill. Let that Ordinance be lapsed.

MR. SPEAKER: If you show me the rule under which I can do it, I will do it.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR: If the time lapses, the Ordinance will lapse itself. After that, you direct the Government to prepare a Bill in consultation with you and other concerned people.

MR. SPEAKER: If you show me the rule under which I can direct the Government to withdraw it, I will do it.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR: if you are satisfied with the reasons and the findings, you can very well do it.

MR. SPEAKER: Okay.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: Actually, there have been precedents where the Ordinances had been withdrawn by the President or by the Vice-President acting on behalf of the President, according to Kaul and Shakhder.

MR. SPEAKER: We are on the point where an Ordinance can be withdrawn or not because on that point there is no dispute at all. The point is in the circumstances what should we do?

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: In your discussion with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, you

had said that you would agree to the supplementary List of Business only if the House agreed to that.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not correct.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: Now it is quite obvious from what the Members have said so far that the House is not in agreement with it.

MR. SPEAKER: They will put it to the vote of the House.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: Therefore, the Supplementary List of Business cannot be accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: Please understand the consequences of that if they put it to the vote of the House.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: If this is so, then the only way out the Government has it to withdraw the Ordinance; and they can do that.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: They can do that. You can appoint a Joint Select Committee of Parliament to look into this matter.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): You have informed us that the postponement of the discussion on the Bill is necessary because the hon. Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs has asked for further consultation with the Leaders of the parties on this subject. I do not know that is the actual character of consultation.

MR. SPEAKER: You please hear me first so that it will be made clear to you all. The Government wants to consult each one of you as the leader of your party; and they think that instead of disposing of this Bill today, they would like to dispose it of tomorrow or day after tomorrow after consultation. If you think what the Government is saying is not correct or should not be accepted, you can very well vote against the Bill tomorrow. But they are seeking time to consult you and take you into confidence.

As far as the Minister is concerned, he told me that there are certain legal difficulties after the WTO has come into existence. If some objection has to be filed, there is a time limit within which that has to be filed. If the Bill is not there, it cannot be filed. I do not know the details of it. I have not grasped them fully. You consult them on this point. If you are convinced you can go ahead with them; if you are not convinced, you vote against the Bill.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Actually, I am addressing my question to him through you. As you know, many Members of Parliament have expressed their views about the fundamental questions involved in this. Our Government has signed the Marakesh Agreement. Our Government has signed it for entering into the WTO.

Sir, I do not know what is the view of other parties but my party is fundamentally opposed to this. Is the Government prepared to discuss on that? If they are prepared to discuss on these fundamental issues today then why it was not taken up earlier also. Therefore, how can I agree for the postponement of the Bill, you are right. I had opposed it yesterday, I may be opposing it

today, I may be opposing it tomorrow. That is one thing that I must do and for that your advice is not at all necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: I withdraw my advice and I tender my apology to you.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Right you are, Sir! Therefore, I want to know from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs what is the objective in consulting different leaders of different parties..... (Interruptions) Is the Government prepared to take into account the fundamental issues in the process of consultation? If they agree what will happen to Marrakech Agreement? What will happen to the WTO Agreement? Is the Government in a position to reverse that and to change that also, I want to know from the hon. Minister?

SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHURI (Serampore): Sir, I am not using hon. Member Shri Chitta Basu's words, but I would like to be clarified on one point, i.e. what would be the status of the discussion with the leaders of opposition. The point is, as you have rightly explained, the Government has in mind that they want to discuss it with the leaders of opposition parties on this bill. I would like to know whether they would be able to amend the Bill proposed by the Government.

Government would be putting forth certain arguments. What harms the hon. Minister, who was on his legs, to submit those proposals or arguments in this House itself. After all, this House includes both cadres and leaders of the Opposition. We may also learn about it. What is the Government offering to the leaders of the opposition parties? It is a Hobson's choice, or an inverted Hobson's choice. They have to support the Bill as is proposed by the Government or they have to reject it. There is no use of rejection there, we can reject it outright here.

I would like to be clarified on one point, whether the Government is ready to abide by the suggested amendments from the leaders of the opposition parties in the meeting. If that be so, the entire body of the Ordinance has been incorporated in this Bill, then the Bill is to be withdrawn. The Bill cannot be kept in suspended animation. If the Bill can be withdrawn then the main body of the Ordinance which has been incorporated in this Bill that Ordinance should be withdrawn. This is a peculiar position, Sir.

We cannot postpone it, we should decide on it. If we vote against it tomorrow, then we can vote against it today itself. We should not wait. But the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs or the Government should explain to us whether the Government is ready to abide by any suggestion which would be made by the leaders of opposition parties.

In fact, on this very floor of the House, some of the suggestions have been made and the Minister was just replying to them. We would like to hear first the reply given by the hon. Minister here.

MR. SPEAKER: You need not repeat that here. He will speak now.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHURI: Then the

Government should assure that the Bill is being withdrawn and is not postponed. If the Bill be withdrawn then the discussion may be made either in the Standing Committee or in the Select Committee or in a meeting of the leaders of opposition parties, that is a different thing. But the Bill must be withdrawn. If the Bill can be withdrawn, this Ordinance should be withdrawn. After all, this Bill and this Ordinance are the same.

MR. SPEAKER: Please do not repeat it now.

.....(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: If you want to take his words as judgement, you can!

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (Pali): Hon. Speaker, Sir, yesterday at the end of the proceedings at 6 o'clock I was present in the House. According to the various developments which took place, a request was made from the Treasury Benches to the Chairman to just extend the time of the House till the Bill was considered, decided and passed.

The Chairman had put it to the House; at that time sensing the views of the House, the time of the House could not be extended and, therefore, it was kept for today. Sir, yesterday actually the hon. Minister started the reply and he has give a part of the reply. There was absolutely no suggestion for deferment or for consultation or whatever it is. It is, therefore, obvious and patent, not latent, that this device is *mala fide*. It is not *bona fide*. If it is *bona fide*, Your Honour can always accept it. If it is *Mala fide*, then Your Honour is to be objective because your Honour represents the entire House, neither this side nor that side. That being so, I would request Your Honour kindly not to permit this circumventing, camouflaging an attempt to overreach the actual majority and minority, which is present. Now, Sir this—the Ruling Party exercises some sort of veto—would not be a healthy precedent in the parliamentary democracy. At the fag end when the votes are to be taken, they say, "We are not able to muster the majority and, therefore, we request for deferring it." That being so, I would request Your honour to be kindly objective and kindly not to allow this device.

SHRI VIDYACHRAN SHUKLA: MR. Speaker Sir, the hon. members know that certain international commitments and agreements had been made with regard to this subject and there is a time-frame related to the commitments that have been made on behalf of India by the Government. Now to keep within the time-frame, we had to promulgate this Ordinance....(Interruptions) Within six weeks of summoning of the House, the Ordinance has to be converted into an Act by the Parliament.

Sir, when the discussion was going on, we found that there were certain points which have to be clarified and we thought that it would be better if we clarify those points with the Leaders of the Opposition and then taken up the Bill for further consideration. In the morning we started the process of consultation and during the consultation, it was found that some more time will be required for

consultation. And, therefore, we have come up with this proposition that instead of today, it could be taken up for consideration tomorrow or if necessary day after tomorrow so that we can complete our process of consultation with all the Opposition parties, who are represented here.

Sir, we are making this consultation with an open mind. We are not saying that we will not agree to this and you must agree to our proposition. We want to listen to whatever suggestions the hon. Members and the various parties make; as far as possible we will accommodate their wishes and we will also tell them our compulsions and our problems in this respect. Therefore, nothing is lost; the Bill has not been withdrawn; the ordinance has not been withdrawn; and what we require is a little time to inform you to take your views, inform me and just give our views to you....(Interruptions)

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): You withdraw the Bill.(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Is this the way you argue in the House?

(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: The consultation has taken place between us and the Leaders of the BJP; The consultation has taken place between us and the Leaders of the Janata Dal and other parties have been requested to spare some time for the consultation. So, it is not as if we have problems about majority or minority or passing the Bill here or not. That is not the question at all. It is only the question of consultation, which is required and the hon. leaders have already acceded to our request for consultation and we are only asking for a little more time.

The Bill will come before the House for its decision. Whatever the decision the hon. House takes, will be binding on all of us. There is not problem about that. The House has to take a decision after the process of consultation is over. The only thing that is required is, some time to complete the process of consultation. After that the House will take its own decision.

MR. SPEAKERS: What is it that you want to say?

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Why were we not consultate before that?

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a question to answer time and again.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Mr. Shukla, when did you decide to consult the Opposition Parties? Is it today? When did they decide to consult the opposition Parties; What sort of consultation do they want now? Our only suggestion is that they should withdraw the ordinance. We have no other suggestion at this stage.

SHRI SOBHANADREESHARA RAO VADDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, though five to ten years' time has been given for the transition period, the Government has come up with this ordinance and the Bill. It will not serve our interest and now at this stage the Government is telling that they will consult the other opposition Parties. What we want is that this Bill should be withdrawn totally.

[Translations]

SHRI SYED SHAHADUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is a saying in Hindi that if a person missing in the morning comes back in the evening, he not called a missing person. It is a matter of delight that the Government has felt that there is a scope for improvement in this Bill. It is a laudable aspect. What he is speaking contains an element of malafide. He really does not want any consultation, otherwise the limit of 24 hours would not have been imposed. Again he assures us to give time, hold discussion and agree to the outcome of the consultation.

[English]

He only wants deferment in order to amass his forces. He does not want an opportunity for consultation. We oppose it because of this element of *mala fide*.

MR. SPEAKER: Now let me first of all make the legal position very clear to you. I am reading proviso to Rule No. 25.

"Provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation."

Discretion is given to the Speaker.

"(ii) Normally the order of business cannot be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the House agrees or the Speaker is satisfied."

"Unless the House agrees or"—not 'and'—it is 'or'— the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation and then the Government Business included in the List of Business may be postponed on the request by the Government in the House and acceded to by Speaker". In the List of Business for 16th November 1956 during the Third Reading of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Audit Bill, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs announced that the Indian Medical Council Bill, the next item on agenda, could be taken up some time later during that Session as the Government were considering certain representations received thereon. Accordingly the Bill was passed over and the next item was taken up for consideration.(Interruptions)...

Now why this kind of interruptions?

I have told the hon. Minister that this should be done in agreement with the Members in the House and if it cannot be done with agreement, then it has to be put to the vote of the House. Whether it should be postponed to tomorrow or not, we will put his Motion to the vote of the House and if the House says that it can be taken up tomorrow, then I do not come in.

But, what is this? (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Simply put, the proposal is this: They say that there are some technical difficulties. They want to explain those technical difficulties to the

leaders. It is not sufficient that they are explained to the leaders. Tomorrow they would be explaining those technical difficulties to the Members in the House also, and supposing the Members in the House are dissatisfied with the explanation given by them, they are at liberty to vote in any fashion they like. The only thing which has to be done is that instead of today it will come up for voting tomorrow. If it is agreeable to you, agree. If it is not agreeable and if the Motion comes from the Government for postponing it to tomorrow, I will take it up.

MAJ. GEN. RETD. BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal): You have just read the rule. I plead my ignorance.

[Translation]

For my personal information I seek a clarification. It is a correct that there are rules and procedures for postponement of agenda items but whether there is any such law under which the speech of a Minister can be stopped when he had begun the answer of a debate going on in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: It can be done at any time. There is no problem in it. (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): I feel that today congress does not have majority in the House that is why this is happening. whether all the items are being postponed for tomorrow solely due to absence of the Member of Congress Party today?

[English]

SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM (Inner Manipur): I wanted to raise this point only. I have been hearing patiently for the past one hour. I would like to propose that the Minister may explain to the House by way of replying and by way of continuing his reply started yesterday. That will give us enough time. Instead of discussing it with the leaders of this House only, the Minister may put all those points before this House and discuss them freely. That will be more clear. This is my opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: If you thing that all those points should be discussed on the floor of the House, I will allow you to discuss those points on the floor of the House. You can also express your views and after the conclusion of the discussion the voting can take place; it may be tomorrow or it may be today.(Interruptions)

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: As requested,. we will take up the Supplementary Item that has been suggested in the House and I am sure that we will be able to satisfactorily conclude the process of consultation by eleven O'clock tomorrow. Therefore, we would request you to take that item.

MR. SPEAKER: I have made my position every clear. If you want to explain why this Bill has to be passed and what is the difficulty in approaching the WTO for filing your objections and all those things, let it be explained to the Members. Let the Members also have their say on that point. If it is concluded, we will put it to the vote of the House. If it is not concluded we can take it up tomorrow.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (DEPARTMENT OF SMALL SCALE INDUSTRIES AND AGRO AND RURAL INDUSTRIES) (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): That is what we want.

[Translation]

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Chittorgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a suggestion because the Government is in a dilemma. You have studied the matter in detail and told about the two alternatives available with you. As per the Rules i.e. either this issue should be decided by the House or the issue should be decided after consultation or by voting in the House. But in view of the dilemma of the Government I suggest that the House should be adjourned for 15 minutes so that we can decide the matter after consultation. It seems that he is at a nonplus totally. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: As directed by you, I can request my colleague, the Minister of State for External Affairs, to explain why it has to be passed within a certain time frame and what are the difficulties. After hearing him and the Minister of State of the Ministry of Commerce, Shri P. Chidambaram, if you still feel that it has to be put through then we can take a decision that way.

MR. SPEAKER: You can start the discussion on it and I will withdraw to my Chamber and call the Leaders and discuss about it with them.

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Otherwise, the simpler way would be to accede to this request for postponement and we can take up the next item on the Agenda.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL: Interventions cannot be like that. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: This is not correct. other Ministers will be allowed to intervene.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL: How can it be, Sir? (Interruptions).

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: A Minister of the Government who has to explain the Government position can do so. We request Shri salman khursheed and Shri Chidambaram to explain the Government position. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Is it is a statement intervening in the debate?

(Interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL: A Minister cannot intervene now. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: You please take your seat. This is not correct. Every Member in the house has a right to speak.

(interruptions)

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL: Let Shri Arunachalam complete his speech. He was very much on his legs.

MR. SPEAKER: you hear Shri Chidambaram also.

(Interruptions)

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Now, we cannot allow him.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED): They have a better chance of hearing me in detail. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: We cannot allow other Ministers to speak.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED: Please hear me.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Under which rule are you speaking? *(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER: I am allowing him.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to you for the opportunity given to me. as the House knows, we have obligations....*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: We would not allow him to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: you cannot stop a Member from speaking. It is not for you to decide about it. I am not going to accept that.

SHRI SALMAN KHURSHEED: Sir, we have obligations under the Agreement which was signed at marakesh while establishing WTO. India has taken the lead in establishing an equitable trading regime for the world. Now, when it is established, and I believe even the hon. Members are fully aware of this, it is well established that India stands to gain in many sectors. it has become apparent that when you negotiate with an equitable regime, it is not possible for it to be a one way traffic.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: May I make a submission to you? About the idea which the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has said, we can utilise the House also for consultation.

Now, consultations also imply what the Treasury Benches wish to put across. They must wish to communicate with us. They cannot force it down. I accept that.

MR. SPEAKER: Jaswant Singhji, you tell me one thing. can any Member stop any other Member from speaking in the House?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No, Sir....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: Is any Minister not being allowed to speak?

MR. SPEAKER: you have not to decide it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SRIKANTA JENA (Cuttack): We are only coming to the rescue of Shri Arunachalam....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: No Member of the House

can be stopped from saying what he wishes to say other than by you. I cannot stop it. You can certainly stop me. you can stop anyone. But I cannot stand up and say that x,y or z from the Treasury benches has no right to speak. They have a right to speak and in attempting to speak land themselves in further difficulty. That is altogether a different matter. But Sir. the point is that if they, the Treasury benches wish to have consultations with us. I appeal to the hon. Minister of State for External Affairs-an enthusiastic Minister, a Minister of some ability—that there is no reason for his to try to shout at the entire opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: No, he is not. He is making submissions.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: This will not result in any consultation. it appears, therefore, that the only answer is that if you wish to establish the wish of the house what does it wishes to do—defer the business till tomorrow or whatever—have a division and obtain the wish of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is Motion I will take it up and if there is no Motion I will not take it up. You can deal with it in any fashion you like.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (Uluberia): Sir, I am on a Point of Order.

MR. SPEAKER: I am very happy to hear the Point of order.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH: I want to be clarified....

MR. SPEAKER: You do not ask me the question. You put a Point of Order under what rule?

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH: Under what rule does a Minister speak and does another Minister intervene? It is the practice that one Minister replies and then it is put to vote. But under what rule a Minister intervenes before a Minister completes his reply....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI VIDYACHARAN SHUKLA: Can you quote the rule under which a Minister is prohibited from intervening? There is no such rule.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH: There is not a single instance. That is the rule and that is the practice.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA (pali); Hon. Chair has already given a decision after explaining all the provisions of relevant rules after applying the mind objectively. Now, the only matter is that the House should decide whether it wants to defer it or not. It means that a voting has to take place on a simple point whether the proceedings of the House are to be deferred or not. It should be put to vote straightaway.

MR. SPEAKER: You should move a Motion for that.

SHRI GUMAN MAL LODHA: It is their proposal that it has to be deferred.

MR. SPEAKER: Are they coming with the proposal?

[Translation]

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in reply to my question you have told that a minister can intervene while another minister is replying. It is correct but after it members from opposition as well as treasury benches will also like to speak. It means that again this issue will be debated with the intention to drag this issue somehow upto 6 P.M...(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: That is allowed in the Parliamentary method.

[Translation]

MAJ. GEN. (RETD.) BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI: My second suggestion should be considered if this issue will have to be continued up tomorrow.

[English]

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH: Will you allow me to bring a Resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: What Resolution? you give me in writing and I can examine that.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, you are aware of the far-reaching consequences of this Patents (Amendment) Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The heavens are not going to fall if you decide it tomorrow.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: Sir, let me complete. When the House adjourned on Thursday, as per the list of business, the Customs (Amendment) Bill was to be discussed and later this Patents (Amendment) Bill would have to be discussed. And after four days of holiday, yesterday, the Government all of a sudden have brought this Patents (Amendment) bill for discussion with the hope that it would get through. But to their dismay, they do not have adequate strength now and that is why they want postponement till tomorrow. My request through you, Sir, is that you were Minister for Science and Technology earlier and you know the far-reaching consequences; it will be disastrous either the Government must accept for voting immediately or it must withdraw this Patents (Amendment) bill and the ordinance altogether. This is my humble submission to you.

SHRI ANIL BASU (Arambagh): Sir, can the freedom of speech of a Minister who was replying to the debate in the House be interrupted by another Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: Let him object. You are interrupting the Minister's freedom, Shri Salman Khursheed's freedom, to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: You are doing it and you are doing in Parliament.

Interruption

SHRI MRUTYUNJAYA NAYAK (Phulbani): Sir, when

the Minister does not have any objection, why are they raising this objection?

[Translation]

SHRI DAU DAYAL JOSHI (Kota): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday when a Member from opposition was speaking, chair had ordered him to sit down as the Minister was to give reply. Mine was the last name in List of Business but it was cut on the grounds that debate has completed and Minister was on his legs for giving reply. I was deprived of my right to speak even when my name was in the List of Business. The Member who spoke prior to me was asked to take his seat and hon. Minister stood up for giving a reply. In such a situation this whole procedure had been completed and you are starting it again. I do not understand that why are you initiating this new procedure whereas my right to speak was taken away yesterday. Shri Salman Khursheed and myself have equal rights. When I was not allowed to speak yesterday, why are you allowing Salman Khursheed to speak on it. It is really astonishing.

15.43 hrs.

MOTION RE: NON POSTPONEMENT OF DISCUSSION ON STATUTORY RESOLUTION.

RE: DISAPPROVAL OF THE PATENTS (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE AND PATENTS (AMENDMENT) BILL

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have received two motions. One motion is from Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura): Sir, it is a joint motion moved by Shri Saifuddin Choudhury and myself.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY (Katwa): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the debate on the Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Patents (Amendment) Ordinance, 1994 (No. 13 of 1994) promulgated by the President on December 31, 1994 and on the motion for consideration of the Patents (Amendment) Bill, 1995 should not be deferred and be taken into consideration today."

MR. SPEAKER: The second motion is from Shrimati Malini Bhattacharya.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA: Sir, I beg to move.

"That the voting on Patents (Amendment) Bill be taken up today."

MR. SPEAKER: I have received the motion moved by Shri Saifuddin Choudhury and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee first and the second motion has come afterwards. So, I will put the motion moved by Shri Saifuddin Choudhury and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee to the vote of the House.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI ANIL BASU: Sir, if the motion is put to the vote

of the House, we want a copy of the motion to be circulated among all the Members.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion moved by Shri Saifuddin Choudhury and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee is that Item Nos. 15 and 16 in today's Business should not be deferred and should be taken up today for consideration and passing.

I shall not put this motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the debate on the Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Patents (Amendment) Ordinance, 1994 (No. 13 of 1994) promulgated by the President on December 31, 1994 and on the motion for consideration of the Patents (Amendment) Bill, 1995 should not be deferred and be taken into consideration today."

Let the lobbies be cleared—
16.00 hrs.

Now, the Lobbies have been cleared.

Again, I put the motion moved by Shri Saifuddin Choudhury and Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the debate on the Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Patents (Amendment) Ordinance, 1994 (No. 13 of 1994) promulgated by the President on December, 31 1994 and on the motion for consideration of the Patents (Amendment) Bill, 1995 should not be deferred and be taken into consideration today."

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 2]

[16.05 hrs.

AYES

Abedya Nath, Mahant (Gorakhpur)
Acharia, Shri Basudeb (Bankura)
Amar Pal Singh, Shri (Meerut)
Anjalose, Shri Thayil John (Alleppey)
Asokaraj, Shri A. (Perambalur)
Bala, Dr. Asim (Nabadwip)
Baliyan, Shri N.K. (Muzaffarnagar)
Bandaru, Shri Dattatraya (Secunderabad)
Barman, Shri Palas (Balurghat)
Barman, Shri Uddhab (Barpeta)
Basu, Shri Anil (Arambagh)
Basu, Shri Chitta (Barasat)
Bhandari, Shrimati Dil Kumari (Sikkim)
Bhargava, Shri Girdhari Lal (Jaipur)
Bhattacharya, Shrimati Malini (Jadavpur)
Chakraborty, Prof. Susanta (Howrah)
Chaudhary, Shri Rudrasen (Bahraich)
Chauhan, Shri Chetan P.S. (Amroha)
Chhatwal, Shri Sartaj Singh (Hoshangabad)
Chikhliya, Shrimati Bhavna (Junagarh)
Choudhary, Shri Ram Tahal (Ranchi)
Choudhury, Shri Lokanath (Jagatsinghpur)
Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin (Katwa)
Das, Shri Dwaraka Nath (Karimganj)
Das, Shri Jitendra Nath (Jalpaiguri)
Dalta, Shri Amal (Diamond Harbour)
Deshmukh, Shri Chandubhai (Bharuch)
Dikshit, Shri Shresh Chandra (Varanasi)
Dome, Dr. Ram Chandra (Birbhum)
Drona, Shri Jagat Vir Singh (Kanpur)
Dubey, Shrimati Saroj (Allahabad)
Gangwar, Dr. P.R. (Pilibhit)
Gangwar, Shri Santosh Kumar (Bareilly)
Giri, Shri Sudhir (Contai)
Gowda, Prof. K. Venkatagiri (Bangalore South)
Gupta, Shri Indrajit (Midnapore)
Hossain, Shri Syed Masudal (Murshidabad)
Janarthanan, Shri M.R. Kadambur (Tirunelveli)
Jaswant Singh, Shri (Chittorgarh)
Jena, Shri Srikanta (Cuttack)
Jeswani, Dr. K.D. (Kheda)

Joshi, Shri Anna (Pune)
Joshi, Shri Dau Dayal (Kota)
Kalka Das, Shri (Karolbagh)
Kesri Lal, Shri (Ghatampur)
Khan, Shri Sukhendu (Vishnupur)
Khanduri, Maj. Gen. (Retd.) Bhuwan Chandra (Garhwal)
Khanoria, Major D.D. (Kangra)
Krishnendra Kaur (Deepa), Shrimati (Bharatpur)
Kumar, Shri V. Dhananjaya (Mangalore)
Lodha, Shri Guman Mal (Pali)
Mahajan, Shrimati Sumitra (Indore)
Mahato, Shri Bir Singh (Purulia)
Mahendra Kumari, Shrimati (Alwar)
Malik, Shri Purna Chandra (Durgapur)
Mallikarjunaiah, Shri S. (Tumkur)
Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar (Joynagar)
Mishra, Shri Ram Nagina (Padrauna)
Misra, Shri Satyagopal (Tamluk)
Mollah, Shri Hannan (Uluberia)
Mukherjee, Shrimati Geeta (Panskura)
Mukherjee, Shri Pramothes (Berhampore)
Mukherjee, Shri Subrata (Raiganj)
Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ajoy (Krishnagar)
Murmu, Shri Rup Chand (Jhargram)
Murthy, Shri M.V.V.S. (Visakhapatnam)
Naik, Shri Ram (Bombay North)
Narayanan, Shri P.G. (Gobichettipalayam)
Oraon, Shri Lalit (Lohardaga)
Pal, Shri Rupchand (Hooghly)
Pandeya, Dr. Laxminarayan (Mandsaur)
Patel, Shri Chandresh (Jamnagar)
Patel, Shri Ram Pujan (Phulpur)
Pathak, Shri Harin (Ahmedabad)
Premi, Shri Mangal Ram (Bijnor)
Rao, Shri D. Venkateswara (Bapatla)
Rawal, Dr. Lal Bahadur (Hathras)
Rawale, Shri Mohan (Bombay—South Central)
Rawat, Prof. Rasa Singh (Ajmer)
Ray, Shri Rabi (Kendrapada)
Raychaudhuri, Shri Sudarsan (Serampore)

Rongpi, Dr. Jayanta (Autonomous district)
 Saikia, Shri Muhi Ram (Nowgong)
 Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman (Ponnani)
 Saraswati, Shri Yoganand (Bhind)
 Sethi, Shri Arjun Charan (Bhadrak)
 Shah, Shri Manabendra (Tenri Garhwal)
 Shakya, Dr. Mahadeepak Singh (Etah)
 Sharma, Shri Rajendra Kumar (Rampur)
 Shastri Acharya Vishwanath Das (Sultanpur)
 Shastri, Shri Vishwanath (Gazipur)
 Singh, Shri Brijhushan Sharan (Gonda)
 Singh, Shri Mohan (Deoria)
 Singh, Shri Pratap (Banka)
 Singh, Shri Rajveer (Aonla)
 Singh, Shri Satya Deo (Balrampur)
 Sivaraman, Shri S. (Ottapalam)

Ahirwar, Shri Anand (Sagar)
 Ahmed, Shri Kamaluddin (Hanamkonda)
 Aiyar, Shri Mani Shankar (Mayiladuturai)
 Anbarasu, Shri R. (Madras Central)
 Arunachalam, Shri M. (Tenkasi)
 Bhardwaj, Shri Paras Ram (Sarangarh)
 Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal (Amritsar)
 Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu (Sambalpur)
 Bhonsle, Shri Prataprao B. (Satara)
 Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh (Jhabua)
 Birbal, Shri (Ganganagar)
 Chaliha, Shri Kirip (Guwahati)
 Chaudhary, Sqn. Ldr. Kamal (Hoshiarpur)
 Chaudhari, Shri Narain Singh (Hissar)
 Chavan, Shri Prithviraj D. (Karad)
 Chavda, Shri Ishwarbhai Khodabhai (Anand)
 Chidambaram, Shri P. (Sivaganga)
 Chowdary, Dr. K.V.R. (Rajahmundry)
 Dalbir Singh, Shri (Shahdol)
 Damor, Shri Somjibhai (Dohad)
 Das, Shri Anadi Charan (Jaipur)
 Deka, Shri Probin (Mangaldoi)
 Delkar, Shri Mohan S. (Dadra and Nagar Haveli)
 Dennis, Shri N. (Nagercoil)
 Deshmukh, Shri Ashok Anandrao (Parbhani)
 Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan (Tripura West)
 Devi, Shrimati Bibhu Kumari (Tripura East)
 Dighe, Shri Sharad (Bombay North Central)
 Faleiro, Shri Eduardo (Mormugao)
 Fernandes, Shri Oscar (Udupi)
 Gajapathi, Shri Gopi Nath (Berhampur)
 Gamang, Shri Giridhar (Koraput)
 Ghatowar, Shri Paban Singh (Dibrugarh)
 Giriappa, Shri C.P. Mudala (Chitradurga)
 Gudadinni, Shri B.K. (Bijapur)
 Handique, Shri Bijoy Krishna (Jorhat)
 Harchand Singh, Shri (Ropar)
 Hooda, Shri Bhupinder Singh (Rohtak)
 Islam, Shri Nurul (Dhubri)
 Jakhari, Shri Balarm (Sikar)
 Jaswant Singh, Shri (Chittorgarh)
 Jeevarathinam, Shri R. (Araconam)

Sreenivaasan, Shri C. (Dindigul)
 Sur, Shri Monoranjan (Basirhat)
 Swami, Shri Chinmayanand (Badaun)
 Swami, Shri Sureshanand (Jalesar)
 Syed Shahabuddin, Shri (Kishanganj)
 Thakore, Shri Gabhaji Mangaji (Kapadwanj)
 Tirkey, Shri Pius (Alipurduars)
 Tomar, Dr. Ramesh Chand (Hapur)
 Topdar, Shri Tarit Baran (Barrackpore)
 Vajpayee, Shri Atal Bihar (Lucknow)
 Vekaria, Shri Shival Nagjibhai (Rajkot)
 Virendra Singh, Shri (Mirzapur)
 Yadav, Shri Chun Chun Prasad (Bhagalpur)
 Yumnam, Shri Yaima Singh (Inner Manipur)
 Zainal Abedin, Shri (Jangipur)

NOES

Kale, Shri Shankarrao D. (Kopergaon)
 Kamble, Shri Arvind Tulshiram (Osmanabad)
 Kanithi, Dr. Viswanatham (Srikakulam)
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila (Rae Bareilly)
 Khursheed, Shri Salman (Farrukhabad)
 Krishnaswamy, Shri M. (Vandavasi)
 Kuli, Shri Balin (Lakhimpur)
 Kumaramangalam, Shri Rangarajan (Salem)
 Kuppaswamy, Shri C.K. (Coimbatore)
 Lakshmanan, Prof. Savithri (Mukundapuram)
 Malik, Shri Dharampal Singh (Sonapat)
 Mallikarjun, Shri (Mahbubnagar)
 Manphool Singh, Shri (Bikaner)
 Marbaniang, Shri Peter G. (Shillong)
 Mujahid, Shri B.M. (Dharwad South)
 Murthy, Shri M.V. Chandrashekhara (Kanakapura)
 Naik, Shri A. Venkatesh (Raichur)
 Nandi, Shri Yellaiah (Siddipet)
 Nawale, Shri Vidura Vithoba (Khed)
 Nayak, Shri Mrutyunjaya (Phulbani)
 Odeyar, Shri Channaiah (Davangere)
 Padma, Dr. (Shrimati) (Nagapattinam)
 Palacholla, Shri V.R. Naidu (Khammam)
 Panigrahi, Shri Sriballav (Deogarh)
 Patel, Shri Uttambhai Harjibhai (Bulsar)
 Patil, Shrimati Pralibha Devisingh (Amravati)
 Patil, Shrimati Surya Kanta (Nanded)
 Patil, Shri Uttamrao Deorao (Yavatmal)
 Patra, Dr. Kartikeswar (Balasore)
 Pattanayak, Shri Sarat (Bolangir)
 Pawar, Dr. Vasant Niwruitti (Nasik)
 Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram (Chandrapur)
 Prabhu Zantye, Shri Harish Narayan (Panaji)
 Pradhani, Shri K. (Nowrangpur)
 Rahi, Shri Ram Lal (Misrikh)
 Rai, Shri Ram Nihor (Robertsganj)
 Ram Babu, Shri A.G.S. (Madurai)
 Ram Badan, Shri (Lalganj)
 Rao, Shri J. Chokka (Karimnagar)
 Reddy, Shri A. Indrakaran (Adilabad)
 Sai, Shri A. Prathap (Rajampet)
 Sangma, Shri Purno A. (Tura)