

Gazette & Debates Section
Parliament Library Building
Room No. FB-025
Block 'G'
Acc. No.25007.....
Dated.20.11.2014.....

THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

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

329

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Thursday, 22nd May, 1952

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

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-15 A.M.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

FIRING ON RAILWAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of an adjournment motion which relates—I am giving the substance of the notice, the original of which is in Hindi, in English—to the firing on the railway employees without due notice by the local authorities on the 25th April, 1952 causing death of two persons and injuries to several others.

I am unable, on the face of it, to entertain this motion. But for the fact, that there are a number of new Members, I would not have taken notice of it. I am mentioning it in the House just to enable them to appreciate the necessary requirements and essentials of an adjournment motion.

In the first place—again I say whatever the nature of the incident may be, however regrettable—there is no basis of urgency in this motion. Obviously the incident took place on the 25th of April and the usual conventional procedure has been, and also the rule, that notice of this motion should have been given on the very first day the session began. A delay of twenty-four hours in giving notice has been considered by previous rulings as a delay which cannot be per-

mitted and it was held by consistent string of rulings that the urgency is lost. That is the first ground.

Then the second ground—the motion itself states, or that is the gist of it—is that the firing was by the local district authorities or the State authorities who have the responsibility for law and order. There is no question of the responsibility of the Government of India in respect of this matter. It is the responsibility of the United Provinces Government and any adjournment motion—if at all permissible—will be a matter for discussion in the United Provinces legislature and not this House.

Then there are other objections. I am not mentioning them as objections, but I am merely stating the facts. On the subject of this firing, a question was tabled in this House by Shri A. K. Gopalan and it was answered on the 20th instant. I allowed the question because it did not raise any question of responsibility. It wanted some information and I thought the Government of India would have the necessary information because some railway employees are concerned. To ask for information is one thing—to move for a debate of that question is quite another. Unless there is some responsibility of the Government there could not be any debate on that question.

Now this question was answered on due date. Thereafter Mr. Gopalan has sent a further communication in which he wishes to raise a half hour discussion under our rules of procedure. He has given the points and I am going to admit his notice only so far as the further information he seeks is concerned. But that is a different matter. The House will have an occasion of having information in regard to the incident, but there will be no question of the discussion of the responsibility.

[Mr. Speaker]

At this stage, I may incidentally inform the House—perhaps new hon. Members may not know—that it is considered to be a contempt of the House and a breach of privilege to give publicity to any notice of motion or question by any Member, unless intimation of its admission is given to the Member. If I mistake not, I think it was yesterday that in the Press there is a mention about Mr. Gopalan's request for raising a discussion. I am not going to take any further step in the matter beyond drawing the attention of Members to this important aspect. Unless a notice is admitted, it is improper to give publicity to it in the press that so and so is going to ask such and such a question, or so and so is going to put this kind of thing or that kind of thing or move this motion or that. It is entirely wrong. It is possible that questions—as it many times happens—which are tabled might not be allowed by the Chair and it is wrong on the part of responsible Members of this House to give publicity to what is not coming before the House.

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon cum Malakkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): It might have leaked from the Parliament Secretariat.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should realise that it is no use casting reflection on the Parliament Secretariat. I can vouch-safe, so far as the Parliament Secretariat is concerned, that it keeps everything secret. It is no use taking cover under that kind of defence. The hon. Member's intervention and defence makes me believe that the source was somewhat on his side. He need not have taken it unless the cap fitted him. I never referred to any person as responsible for it. Most probably the information leaked out from the source which gave notice. I never said that they did it intentionally. I have assumed that, it was ignorance on their part of the parliamentary procedure and I was proceeding on that line. It is really a bad defence and his colleagues will perhaps realise that they should be saved from such a friend when he tries to make a defence by throwing the responsibility on the Parliament Secretariat.

I am unable, therefore, either to entertain, much less, to give my consent to this motion.

SUPPLY OF AGENDA PAPERS TO MEMBERS

Mr. Speaker: According to the present practice copies of the following papers are supplied to Members at their residences and they are requested to preserve copies of such papers and to bring them for use in the Chamber when the respective business relating to such papers is subsequently taken up in the House:

- (1) Bills as introduced;
- (2) Reports of Select Committees on Bills after presentation;
- (3) Lists of amendments to Bills, Resolutions and Motions including lists of cut motions to demands for grants.

There are other papers, mention of which was made a few days back in the Parliamentary Bulletin.

Copies of these papers are not included in the daily sets of papers of Members in the House, but a few copies are made available in the Lobby Office and the Parliamentary Notice Office in order to meet the demands of Members who fail to bring their copies. This system has worked well for all these years and has been very economical. Hon. Members might have noticed that certain papers are always placed on the Members' seats—lists of questions, agenda and some other papers. It was the intention to observe as to what the result of the first experiment was and then to follow it up in regard to other papers also, as a matter of economy. We cannot go on spending and wasting money on paper and printing.

I propose to adopt the same procedure in regard to supply of copies of list of business and list of questions which is followed in the case of Bills and lists of amendments and cut motions. The list of business and the list of questions will continue to be circulated to Members in advance as heretofore but will not be placed again on their seats in the House in future. Hon. Members are requested to preserve these copies of agenda papers and question lists and to bring them for use in the House from day to day. Some sets of agenda papers and question lists will also be placed in the Lobby Office; and in case any Member forgets to bring his papers, a set will be supplied to him on request. I end with the hope that Members will not be forgetful in bringing their papers.

Now, we will proceed with the Railway Budget.