

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

was elected to the International Court at the Hague.

In spite of this prolonged record of service he was not an old man. He was slightly older than I am—and I do not consider myself too old to do work yet. As I said, he was a contemporary of mine for a while at Cambridge. He had been ill for a long time, and for the last fortnight or so we had been led to expect that he would not recover. Nevertheless his passing away is a matter of sorrow and shock to all of us who looked upon him as the perfect civil servant in one way, and also as an ideal servant of India in other ways too.

So I think it is right that mention of the passing away of such an eminent son of India should be made in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Although, as stated by the hon. the Leader of the House, it is not the practice in this House to make references to the passing away of non-Members, either of this Parliament or its predecessors, when the hon. the Leader of the House asked me as to whether I could permit him to make a reference, I instinctively felt that I must, because the case here is quite exceptional. Apart from the unique personality of Mr. B. N. Rau and his eminent services to the country, what weighed most with me was that he was, as it were, interwoven in our present parliamentary life. He worked for it during the last few years of his life, and we all know what a valuable document in the form of the Constitution we have got. He was also the architect of the Hindu Law reform Bills. Thus his association with Parliament or the Legislature was so extensive and so wide that it is only technically that he was not a Member of Parliament. Apart from that, of course, he was an eminent Indian and it is but proper that we all should gratefully remember him and express our sorrow at his sad demise at a comparatively, (as the Leader of the House said), young age.

We may send our condolences to his family in their sad bereavement. I entirely associate myself with all that the Leader of the House has said.

The House may stand in silence for a minute as a mark of respect.

The House then stood in silence for a minute.

PARLIAMENTARY PROPRIETY

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta, North-East): Sir, may I have your permission to mention a matter which has important implications in the context of our parliamentary life today? I submit that the Minister of Commerce and Industry, when he spoke on the 25th November in reply to the discussion of his motion for consideration of the Dhooties Bill, chose to use certain expressions regarding Communist Members of this House and particularly one of them, Mr. Gopala Rao, which were an unambiguous reflection on their *bona fides* and were therefore equally an unambiguous reflection on the House. I submit if I were present at that time I certainly would have drawn the Chair's attention to the Minister's lapse. But I happened to be in a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee, and I have taken the earliest opportunity of bringing the matter to your notice.

The Minister said in the course of his speech—I am quoting from pages 2102—2112 of the cyclostyled report:—

"Mr. Gopala Rao asks: 'What have you done?' Must I give this Rs. 3½ crores to Mr. Gopala Rao so that he can fight an election? Then it is very logical! Give the money to him.

Shri Gopala Rao: That means you refuse to learn.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I refuse to yield any place to communism. I refuse to accept your *bona fides*. I refuse to believe that you do any good to the people. I refuse to believe that anything

good can come from that section of the House."

Now, Sir, it is common knowledge, I submit, that parliamentary propriety demands—they laugh best who laugh last—parliamentary propriety demands that reflection must not be cast in debate on Members of either House of Parliament, and parliamentary language is never more desirable, as Erskine May puts it, than when a Member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate—a point which Ministers of Government with enormous majorities at their back should very particularly be called upon to remember. The Minister, I submit, has imputed *mala fides* to the Members of the Opposition particularly to the Communist section of the Opposition, and questioned their *bona fides*. He has gone further and has insinuated by a stretch of imagination that I cannot appreciate, that certain moneys, if utilised for the handloom weavers would swell the election coffers of the Communist party. I beg of you, Sir, to give careful consideration to this point, particularly in view of the mass majority which the Government has behind it, and that is why I seek your protection against this kind of reflection being made particularly by a Minister of Government.

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I seek a clarification, Sir, because the hon. Minister is supposed to address the Chair and he has said, "I refuse to accept your *bona fides*."

Mr. Speaker: Whatever one may think about the particular incident, to my mind the point raised is a very serious and important one. Of course, the hon. Member who raised the point does not go so far as to say that there has been a breach of any privilege. That question does not arise and it is clear that no question of privilege is involved in this. As regards the other point that he made, I think the Chair should not express any opinion. But, in the interest of harmonious working of the House, I would certainly desire that all of us use very moderate and persuasive language and do not attri-

bute motives to each other. That is the only thing that I wish to say. Thereby I do not find fault with the hon. Minister who uttered these words. Perhaps, on the spur of the moment, he was led by sentiment and gave expression to these views. All I mean is that we should try to avoid such attributing of motives. That is all.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): May I submit, Sir, that I had not even the remotest idea of making any reflection on the conduct of the hon. Member concerned? So far as the Party is concerned, I must reserve to myself the right to say what I believe about the party.

Shri S. S. More: Outside the House.

Shri Punnoose (Alleppey): I would like to bring to your notice, Sir, that this hon. Minister has been repeating such things....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Punnoose: On one occasion, he referred to the parentage of one hon. Member. On another occasion....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I make a submission to you, Sir, and through you to the Leader of the House, who, unfortunately, to my mind, seems to forget that he is not only the leader of his party and his Government, but also of the House. I wish you, Sir, to convey to him that it is desirable for him to be in the House for longer intervals than he usually is. If he were present on the occasion when his colleague chose to make such remarks, he would have certainly intervened. I think Parliamentary decorum requires that the Leader of the House should be present for longer intervals in this place so that the kind of infraction of Parliamentary rules and proprieties which his colleague, I submit, has made, does not recur. That is a request which I have made much earlier and I repeat it with all the seriousness at my command.

The Prime Minister and the Leader of the House (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, the hon. Member has, in making the suggestion about my being present here more, as well indirectly censured me for my previous behaviour in my not being present as long as I should have been. In doing so, he is, perhaps, going against the very point that he has raised. I do not myself see what relation it bears. It is not the business of the Leader of the House to sit in the House, if I may say so with all respect, to see that other Members behave. You are there, Sir, to see that they behave. Certainly, the Leader of the House and in fact, other Members and Ministers, should attend to their duties in this House. But, surely, the House will not desire that the Leader of the House or others should sit here when they are not required for any particular work, at the cost of other important work.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): May I ask one important question, Sir? Is it Parliamentary or is it not parliamentary for a Member to say that a particular political group or political party is not inclined this way or the other, or to challenge the *bona fides* of a particular political philosophy? Otherwise, what are we here for?

Mr. Speaker: I think we need not enter into an academic or problematic questions. The issue is very simple and I need not be called upon to express my opinion on the question raised by the hon. Shri Gadgil. Let us proceed straight to the next business. The Secretary will read a message from the Council of States.

MESSAGES FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATES

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following two messages received from the Secretary of the Council of States:

(1) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 125 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Bual-

ness in the Council of States, I am directed to inform the House of the People that the Council of States, at its sitting held on the 25th November, 1953, agreed without any amendment to the Rehabilitation Finance Administration (Amendment) Bill, 1952, which was passed by the House of the People at its sitting held on the 17th November, 1953."

(2) "In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I am directed to return herewith the Sea Customs (Amendment) Bill, 1953, which was passed by the House of the People at its sitting held on the 17th November, 1953 and transmitted to the Council of States for its recommendations and to state that the Council has no recommendations to make to the House of the People in regard to the said Bill."

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

AMENDMENTS TO THE EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS SCHEME, 1952

The Minister of Labour (Shri V. V. Giri): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 7 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952, a copy of the Ministry of Labour Notification No. PF-536(2), dated the 28th October, 1953, making certain further amendments to the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952. [Placed in Library. See No. S-173/53.]

NOTIFICATION UNDER THE DELHI ROAD TRANSPORT AUTHORITY ACT, 1950.

The Deputy Minister of Railways and Transport (Shri Alagesan): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Ministry of Transport Notification No. 18-TAG(19)/53, dated the 10th September, 1953, under sub-section (3) of section 52 of the Delhi Road