

Date:.....20.11.2014...

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)
OFFICIAL REPORT

2819

2820

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Monday, 30th June, 1952

*The House met at a Quarter Past Eight
of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-13 A.M.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): Sir, I had given notice of an adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: I communicated to the hon. Member that I do not give my consent to it.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know the reason?

Mr. Speaker: The reasons are well-known. As I have said more than once, the question that he proposes to raise is not the responsibility of the Government of India. He proposes to discuss the conduct or affairs under the sole jurisdiction of an independent sovereign foreign country, so far as India is concerned. Howsoever much we might have feelings over the matter, still, a motion to discuss the conduct of an independent foreign Government cannot be entertained on the floor of this House. After having explained a number of times as to how, and under what circumstances an adjournment motion could be tabled properly, I have now thought it fit, instead of taking the time of the House, to refuse consent and inform the Member. I, therefore, do not propose to take such cases in the House, unless I feel that there is some point
100 PSD

which I may have to convey to hon. Members.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): Will you kindly come out with your several declarations on the points of procedure which will enable the Members to understand those points and guide their conduct in the light of these declarations?

Mr. Speaker: It is always open to hon. Members to see me in case they have any doubt about it. But, when I find that adjournment motions are coming in, in spite of the clarification of the whole position on so many adjournment motions, I am not prepared to treat these adjournment motions as coming out of ignorance, as the hon. Member is pleading. There are various reasons why I do not want to discuss these motions in the House. One of them is—I am not attributing this to the hon. Member in particular—that I do not propose to give publicity to an hon. Member's views by allowing his adjournment motion to be read in the House. There are other means of publicity. He can go to the press—if he so likes. But the House should not be used as a medium for the purpose of seeking publicity on a particular question. As I said, I am not making any insinuation or drawing any inference about the hon. Member, who has given notice in this case.

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): Sir, May I submit

Mr. Speaker: In the form of submissions many things can be said on the floor of this House.

Shri Nambiar: If an hon. Member feels that it is an urgent matter of importance in his own judgment is he not entitled to bring to the notice of the House that urgent matter and have it clarified?

Mr. Speaker: He is perfectly entitled. But in the case of adjournment

[Mr. Speaker]

motions which are obviously inadmissible under any rule, of any Parliament, I am not going to read those motions in the House.

Shri N. S. Nair (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara): Sir, on a point of information, may I know whether it is impossible, or out of order, to raise a question which concerns another Government and for this House to express its opinion in the matter, especially when it is a matter of urgent importance?

Mr. Speaker: In a sense it is permissible, but not in the form of an adjournment motion. Hon. Members will get many opportunities—they have, in fact. They discuss the External Affairs Ministry. They have many other occasions for discussion when they can air their grievances or submit their observations or suggestions to the Government of India. But that does not mean that, every time an hon. Member feels that a matter, though it relates to an independent, sovereign Government, is of importance in his view, therefore he is entitled to table an adjournment motion. That is the only point.

So far as matters which are ordinarily admissible, I am prepared to accept—accept in the sense of reading it in the House—the hon. Member's opinion about the importance and urgency of his own motion. But, as I said, in the case of obviously inadmissible motions, it is a bad thing to allow such a practice to grow.

Shri S. S. More: May we know what exactly is the nature of the adjournment motion?

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to disclose it.

Shri S. S. More: We cannot understand the point and significance of your remarks unless we know.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. It is not for the hon. Member to be satisfied as to whether the Speaker should give his consent or not. It is a matter solely for the discretion of the Speaker. The hon. Member's attempt is to know and give publicity to the point, which I do not want. It is very clear.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: On a point of order. Is it in order to say that I wanted to move this adjournment motion with a view to give publicity?

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Unless I give my consent it cannot be done: he cannot put a question or move an ad-

ournment motion, even for the information of the House, unless I consent. Hon. Members may feel that it is a sort of—what shall I say?—suppression by the Speaker, but there is no way out of it.

We will proceed to the further business.

Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain): On a point of order. Can a thing be given publicity, which has been disallowed by you?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think I am called upon to decide it. But the hon. Member is free to do what he likes and take the consequences of what he does. I shall consider the question as, and when it arises and not now.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ENQUIRY REPORT re GORAKHPUR FIRING

The Minister of Home Affairs and States (Dr. Katju): I beg to lay on the table a copy of the Enquiry Report of the Commissioner, Banaras-Gorakhpur Division in respect of the Gorakhpur Firing on the 25th April, 1952, in pursuance of the undertaking given during the half-an-hour discussion on the 28th May, 1952, on points arising out of the answer given on the 20th May, 1952, to starred question No. 56 regarding firing on railway employees at Gorakhpur. [Placed in library. See No. P-19/52]

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that upto the time fixed for receiving nominations for the Public Accounts Committee, 19 nominations were received. Subsequently 4 members withdrew their candidature. As the number of candidates is equal to the number of vacancies in the Committee, I declare the following Members to be duly elected:—

1. Shri B. Das.
2. Pandit Munishwar Dutt Upadhyay.
3. Shri M. L. Dwivedi.
4. Shri Shree Narayan Das.
5. Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh.
6. Shri Balwant Nagesh Datar.
7. Shri Ranbir Singh Chauduri.
8. Acharya Shriman Narayan Agarwal.
9. Dr. Mono Mohon Das.