

[Mr. Speaker]

education, there is sanitation; everything is here. But when he means Government, he refers to the U.P. Government; at least I take that to be his intention.

".....to start the factory now after six months of utterly illegal and deliberate lock-out by recruiting black-legs after wrongfully dismissing almost all its labour force numbering over one thousand....."

I do not think I need read it further. It makes various statements of facts about the correctness of which nobody can be sure, at least in this House or under this Government. I find the statements made in a rather reckless language. We do not know the facts and therefore I do not propose to read the motion further; but I will dispose of it on the simple ground that it is a State subject and has nothing to do with the responsibility of the Centre.

#### ALLOCATION OF TIME ORDER

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Satya Narayan Sinha on the 26th July, 1955:

"That this House agrees with the allocation of time proposed by the Business Advisory Committee in regard to the Government legislative and other business as announced by the Deputy-Speaker on the 26th July, 1955."

In this respect also, I believe there is either a misapprehension or a not proper apprehension of facts. The House knows that it has to put through a certain amount of business and therefore it becomes necessary, taking into consideration the overall picture of business as also the needs of the individual pieces of legislation or motions, to consider as to what would be the best and fair allocation of time. For this purpose, a Business Advisory Committee was constituted. The com-

mittee is representative of all sections in the House. It is not that the committee functions by a majority. The Members in the committee representing the various groups and even individuals sit together, take into consideration the importance—the relative importance—of this measure and that measure in relation to the entire business of the House and then decide as to what would be the probable time that is required and come to a conclusion which, I may mention, is many times a compromise conclusion on the side of giving more time,—not of curtailing time,—and the conclusions are all unanimous. That has been the practice till now. Every effort is made to see that there is unanimity on the point of allocation of time, because the committee is very keen to see that the Members' legitimate right of making speeches or moving amendments or having a say on a particular subject is not curtailed and proper time is given. After that, the motion comes before the House. Of course, there is also a rule made here—rule 37—to recognise the inherent right of every Member to move any amendment to the motion. Nobody denies that a Member has a right to move any amendment to any motion, but it will be accepted that that right does require some limitation in practice as a matter of convention, if business is to be put through and if the Parliament is to function efficiently and properly. Such motions, therefore, have been always treated—till now at least—as formal motions, because all sections of the House are represented on the committee, and what the committee decides is after considering all points of view. Still, I am not saying that Members have no right to move amendments; they can move amendments as they like, and considering the possibility, a rule was also framed that an individual speech should not be of more than five minutes and the discussion should not continue for more than half an hour—rule 37. Here the amendments moved or sought to be moved by Mr. Kamath who is followed by another Member—he too perhaps tables his amendments for the

first time—are advocating extension of time. I am just stating the practical difficulties. The hon. Member is entitled perfectly to urge whatever point he likes and is within his legal rights in moving the amendments. I am repeating this so that he need not think that there is going to be any curtailment of the right of a Member to move an amendment. The matter stands on practical considerations. The allocation of time has to take into consideration the entire business so far as possible and the relative importance; the committee have made allocations in this manner. The hon. Member wants extensions. It is in the hands of the House now to extend or not to extend; but I am trying to give the background as to how the committee was formed, why it was formed and what is its objective. And last but not the least, I am suggesting to the House that we are the first Parliament and we are therefore trying to establish certain conventions which we will be following continuously. Of course, we may err and if we err, we shall be correcting ourselves and we shall be changing also. But let some kind of conventions be formed and let motions of this type, amendments of this type, not be brought in the way it has been done. For the third time I repeat, I do not dispute the right. It is a help to create a convention just as in the matter of Appropriation Bills. We concede the right of a Member to make a speech on the Appropriation Bill. But, we have adopted a convention, which is now firm, that nobody gets up and an Appropriation Bill is put through in two minutes or one minute. Similarly, in this case also, I would like hon. Members to take into consideration all these points of view.

There is one further aspect which I may mention. If a business is taken up and it is felt in the House that more time is required, the time is extended by taking the consensus of opinion in the House. There is also the other experience in the Bill which was put through—the Tariff (Amendment) Bill. The Committee's allocation was about three hours and the matter was disposed of within 1½ hours. That

would also show as to how this Committee is functioning. It is not the idea to muzzle anybody; the idea is to help to put through the business of the House. I remember in the last session also, on a certain measure,—I do not remember what measure it was—with a view to attain unanimity, a certain period of 5 hours was agreed to; but the Bill collapsed in two hours—there was nothing further about it—it collapsed in the sense that the time insisted on was not made use of. All this is done because we want to create a kind of convention whereby the Members formally and informally meet and agree to a programme and willingly allow their rights to be curtailed if it comes to that. That is the background. I shall now put the motion.....

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad):** Sir, with great deference to the judgment....

**Mr. Speaker:** He can move his amendment. His time is five minutes.

**Shri Kamath:** I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

“subject to the following modifications that—

(a) ‘5 hrs.’ instead of ‘3 hrs.’ be allotted to Indian Coinage (Amendment) Bill.

(b) ‘5 hrs.’ instead of ‘3 hrs.’ be allotted to Abducted Persons (Recovery and Restoration) Continuance Bill.

(c) ‘5 hrs.’ instead of ‘3 hrs.’ be allotted to Spirituous Preparations (Inter-State Trade and Commerce) Control Bill.

(d) ‘15 hrs.’ instead of ‘10 hrs.’ be allotted to Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill, (Motion for reference to Select Committee).

(e) ‘15 hrs.’ instead of ‘10 hrs.’ be allotted to Citizenship Bill, (Motion for reference to Select Committee).

(f) ‘40 hrs.’ instead of ‘25 hrs.’

[Shri Kamath]

be allotted to Companies Bill, (for General Discussion only), and

(g) '20 hrs.' instead of '10 hrs.' be allotted to discussion on the Reports of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes for the years ending 31st December, 1953 and 31st December, 1954."

With great deference to the judgment and wisdom of the all-parties Business Advisory Committee over which you yourself preside,...

Mr. Speaker: I may tell him that at this meeting I did not preside. Sometimes I preside: not always.

Shri Kamath: I did not say you presided at this meeting. I submit that in certain circumstances the Committee may not be regarded as infallible in its decisions and I may, in all humility, say that this is one of those situations. However, after the last part of your observations wherein you said that the time schedule for any Bill before the House can always be extended with the consensus, or unanimous or majority opinion of the House, I concede that much of the *raison d'être* for this amendment no longer exists. Yet, I would suggest that so far at least, as these two Bills are concerned—they are very important in my humble judgment—the Citizenship Bill and the Companies Bill,—in my estimation they deserve much more time than has been allotted to them by the Business Advisory Committee. In the last Parliament, I remember, there was no such time schedule fixed beforehand for the consideration of Bills. The usual weapon in the armoury of the House and you too, was, if a speech was insufferably dull or irrelevant or repetitive, to call the Member to order,—and the supreme weapon of moving for closure which you, in your judgment and wisdom, did not always accept, sufficed for regulating the consideration of Bills and debates in Parliament. I may also, if the House will pardon me, a personal reminiscence recall that in September, 1952 when I observed from the gallery the House

of Commons proceedings, I noticed that there was no time-limit imposed on the speeches of Members as is now the case here. Yesterday, for the first time, I found that speeches on Bills were restricted to 15 or 20 minutes, which was not the case in the last Parliament. It is, may I say, rather improper to impose restrictions on Members who have got something to contribute to the debate on any measure before the House. If Members' time are restricted and if they are told beforehand that they will have to confine their observations to 15 minutes, their contribution in certain cases may not be as effective as it might otherwise be. I, therefore, suggest that in the first place, this time-limit on speeches that is being observed nowadays in this Parliament should go, and the debate should be regulated as was used to be done in the last Parliament. You used to do it and the Deputy-Speaker used to do it very well in the last Parliament. I do not see any reason why that practice should not be followed in this Parliament as well. I do not wish to take any more time of the House, but, I wish to suggest that, in the first place, this time-limit on Members' speeches on Bills before the House,—this rule or convention—should be done away with. Every motion of the Business Advisory Committee,—every motion like this containing a time-schedule for the entire legislative work—should like any other motion be brought before the House for discussion, and approval with or without change. I really grant that the House may not always amend the motion. There may be certain situations, however when such change may be necessary.

In this particular case, I do not insist upon the changes suggested with regard to all the Bills. But, certainly I would like the House to consider earnestly my amendments so far as the Citizenship Bill and the Companies Bill are concerned. I have suggested that for the Citizenship Bill the time may be extended from 10 to 15 hours and for the Companies Bill from 25 to 40

hours. May I, in the end, also state that I did a bit of arithmetic? The total number of hours allotted to the various Bills comes to 90. On an arithmetical computation, it works out to 18 working days at the rate of 5 hours a day. The House according to the calendar is going to sit for 49 or 50 days. Again on some Saturdays the House will sit and as the House is aware, the sittings are sometimes extended beyond evening, until nightfall or even till midnight as happened in the last Parliament more than once. I do not know if this Parliament has experienced that. But we had dinners outside on the lawns at night.

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** We have no experience of that dinner here.

**Shri Kamath:** But we had. I am sorry for you.

**Mr. Speaker:** He can proceed.

**Shri Kamath:** Is that bell intended for Shri More or for me?

**Mr. Speaker:** For Shri Kamath.

**Shri Kamath:** My suggestion for extension of time would mean an increase of only about 4 days. Still we will have another 28 days for the other legislative business of the Government. And considering that the House has always sat in accordance with your instructions, longer in the day and also on Saturdays sometimes, I do not see any reason why this amendment as a whole should not be accepted, or at least this part of the amendment relating to the Citizenship Bill and the Companies Bill. I commend this amendment for the acceptance of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** The amendment is now before the House.

**Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati):** All that Shri Kamath has not asked is that God may extend the period of a day from 24 to 30 hours. He has further gone into the fundamentals. Under the rules there is a Business Advisory Committee. It is too late for him if he goes back to the Noah's Arc period. It might have been so in 1952 when he

was here. This Business Advisory Committee had not been appointed. Rules had not been framed. By way of amendment it is not open to him to question the rules themselves. Therefore, he must abide by the rules. So, when once the Business Advisory Committee goes into this matter and decides that so much time should be allotted for a particular Bill, it becomes necessary to restrict, to impose a time-limit on speeches. But we never insisted that 20 minutes should be stuck to. As a matter of fact, yesterday though five hours had been allotted for the Industrial Finance Corporation Bill, after five or six speeches—of course, no hon. Member's speech ought to be criticised; all are hon. Members, they have spoken exceedingly well—they only went on emphasizing what others had already said, at least many of them. That gave added emphasis to the proceedings. Under these circumstances, to say that we are curtailing the freedom of speech is wrong. As a matter of fact, though he said that 20 minutes are allowed by the Speaker, I allowed 35 minutes in one case and 40 minutes in another case and so on. Nobody ever complained, and the debate was as full as could be ordinarily expected.

The Business Advisory Committee is fully representative of all parties, and even others had been invited. I was presiding in your absence, Sir and I had made it clear to every hon. Member who was a party to the proceedings there that it was open to him to suggest a limit and that if others also agreed with the reasonableness of the demand, I was willing to go as far as they liked. And I imposed a condition that it was obligatory on them to stand by what they did. There was unanimity with respect to this. I do not think any hon. Member who was there representing any party or group would ever say that we wanted to hustle either there or here. I am sure hon. Members will not keep quiet but utilise the ten minutes allotted to them; let each one of them who was a party stand up here and support it. Otherwise, there is no meaning in being members of the Business Advisory

[Shri M. A. Ayyangar]

Committee. Let it not be left only to the Chairman to go on, either there or here to support.

So far as the length of time is concerned, my friend calculated 50 days and so on. We have not yet come to the other stages of the Company Law Bill. For the first stage alone we have devoted or allotted 25 hours. Hon. Members are aware that though 25 hours were fixed, freedom was given to the Speaker or whoever might be presiding to extend this by five hours more. My hon. friend might have asked other Members here. He wants their assistance in allowing him to speak. He may have asked them about this. They are not far away from him. Under the circumstances, no rigidity is observed here. On the other hand, we allow hon. Members to exhaust themselves also sometimes. That is what is happening in the House. Therefore, to say that the rest of the time should be devoted only to the first stage of the Companies Bill and that the second stage may be concluded in the interval or recess is wrong. His suggestion has no legs to stand upon.

So far as the Citizenship Bill is concerned, the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs originally suggested that 15 hours may be allotted. That was on the footing that all the stages of the Bill would be discussed here, and there would not be any reference to a Select Committee. On account of the importance of the Bill we suggested—and there was unanimity of opinion—that this Bill might be referred to a Select Committee, in which case 15 hours would be a waste of time of the House for Select Committee reference only. At that stage we thought ten hours would be enough. It is not as if we go on extending the hours of the day. We come at 11 O'Clock, and even without going for lunch, some of us continue to work here till 5 P.M., and very often we are prepared to sit till 6 P.M.

Fandit Thakur Das Bhargava (Gurgaon): Some of us who work on the

Committees come at 8-30 and go after six.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: Yes, we have Committee meetings, and in between there is work. At 4 O'Clock I have got a committee today. I know how many hours you, Sir, work. My hon. friend has come in only just now.

Shri Kamath: I was here long enough.

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: He might have been. It is idle to contend that we should automatically go on extending the time from 4 to 5 hours, from 5 to 6 hours and so on, and put in an amendment. I would only urge upon every Member of this House that there is no intention to hustle, and neither the hon. Speaker nor I have ever hustled. We have been anxious to get as complete an opinion as possible and give as much opportunity of debate as possible to every section of the House and every individual so long as he does not repeat himself. I would respectfully urge the House not to change even a comma in the motion, and not to accept even a single amendment of the hon. Member.

Shri Asoka Mehta (Bhandara): Even before the Deputy-Speaker made a pointed reference to me.....

Shri M. A. Ayyangar: No. no. I only turned to you.

Shri Asoka Mehta:.....I was going to speak on the subject. He made a pointed reference to me because I happen to represent my party in the Business Advisory Committee. You were good enough to invite my friend and colleague, Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani, to that Committee. We have been functioning in that committee for a long time and I am happy to endorse everything that you have said about the way in which that committee functions, and we have found that while you have very often given us valuable guidance, we have been equally happy when, in your absence, the Deputy-Speaker has been in the Chair also.

As far as the last meeting of the Business Advisory Committee was concerned, all the decisions were taken by consultation and by complete agreement. Unfortunately, full details are not given here as the Deputy-Speaker pointed out. Twentyfive hours allotted for the Companies Bill are only for the first stage, for general discussion. There also, the Deputy-Speaker pointed out that if there was a question of floor or ceiling, it might be extended even to 30 hours. The total time that the Government themselves had suggested was 90 hours, but we felt that it would be too early at this time to decide how much time should be allotted to clause by clause discussion. In the course of the general discussion it might emerge as to what are the clauses to which special attention should be given and accordingly future programme could be drawn up.

Likewise, some of us are very anxious that other questions of policy should be taken up. We had a discussion whether more time should be given to Bills or whether we should divide our time between discussion of Bills and issues of policy. You will recollect that some time back we had a discussion on economic policy which was very useful. At that time, you yourself had said that only the industrial policy might be taken up; then and agricultural policy might be taken up at some later time. There are a number of other questions which some of us have brought up and time has to be found for this kind of policy discussion also. All these things are entered in the minutes. Unfortunately, the minutes are not made available to all the Members. I do not know if a convention cannot be created by which they could be distributed to all the Members so that they would know what we are discussing inside the Business Advisory Committee. As far as my hon. friend Shri Kamath is concerned, well, it is a question of considering the wisdom of the new Parliament in the light of the wisdom of the old Parliament. I am not com-

petent to go into that matter, because I had not the privilege of sharing the wisdom of the old Parliament. But it is my fault that as a representative of the party I should not have sat down with him and explained to him the conventions on which we have been working. I apologise to you for not having fulfilled my responsibilities. At the same time, I would appeal to my valued colleague Shri Kamath not to press his amendment, and I can assure him that in future—as we have always done in the past also—before we attend the Business Advisory Committee meeting, we would be normally consulting our colleagues in Parliament, because we do not go there and put forward our individual opinions. But this time, the meeting was held—and I was very happy it was held—on the very first day when Parliament assembled, and for various reasons into which I need not go, it was not possible for us to consult all our colleagues. But if there is any blame to be attached, the blame should be attached to me only.

I would, therefore, request Shri Kamath to withdraw his amendment, and I would also request you, Sir, not to consider this as a kind of any breach of convention on the part of Shri Kamath. If anything has been done, which should not have been done, it is because I failed to fulfil my responsibility.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan** (Cannanore): I do not want to speak much. I also think that it is necessary that we have to respect the decisions of the Business Advisory Committee. If, on the other hand, this new procedure that has come up today is accepted and there are going to be amendments to the decisions of the Business Advisory Committee, then there is no need to have a Business Advisory Committee at all. If the Business Advisory Committee is going to discuss something first, and later on Members belonging to the different parties and groups are also going to bring forward amendments like the present one, then we shall have to consider the question whether there

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

should be a Business Advisory Committee at all. So, I would also request my hon. friend Shri Kamath to withdraw his amendment.

As far as policies are concerned, certainly there are certain policies to be discussed. And as my hon. friend Shri Asoka Mehta has just stated, there are certain things that have to be discussed in the case of Bills in particular and when Bills are discussed, there is also the right to see that enough time is given for the discussion. But those are different matters.

As far as this amendment is concerned, I would only say this, in regard to the functioning of the Business Advisory Committee. I would like to point out that whenever there is a discussion in the Business Advisory Committee, usually there are so many differences between each party and group, as far as the timings are concerned; one may like to have more time for one subject, and another may like to have more time for another. But we adjust ourselves there, so that only the thing that is generally agreeable is put forward here. So, I feel that whatever difficulties may be there, the decisions or recommendations of the Business Advisory Committee must be placed here, and as a convention they must be accepted.

If any change in the constitution of the Business Advisory Committee or any such thing is to be made, then certainly Shri Kamath can make his representation to see that the practice of individual Members bringing forward amendments to the recommendations of the Business Advisory Committee is allowed. But if that is done, then I feel the Business Advisory Committee's function itself will come to a close. If, however, we want the Business Advisory Committee to function, and if we think that it is better to have some decisions, then I feel that Shri Kamath's amendment should not be accepted.

वीडियो टाकर वाच भागब : श्री कामत साहब की तकरीर को सुन कर मुझे कोई ताज्जुब नहीं

हुआ है। उस वक्त जब यह बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी बनी थी हमारे दिनों में यह खयाल आया था कि जो बड़ी लम्बी चीज़ी तकरीर करने वाले हैं, और जिन में से मैं भी एक हूँ, उन का क्या बनेगा। मेरे लायक दोस्त क्योंकि नये आये हैं और उन के दिवस में भी यही खयाल है, और इसी प्वाइंट आफ व्यू को ले कर उन्होंने यह तरकीबें पेश की हैं। लेकिन मैं उन से जर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं ने भी डिप्टी स्पीकर व स्पीकर साहब की एबसेंस में कई बार इस कमेटी पर प्रिजाइड किया है और मैं ने वहाँ पर कई कानूनों के लिए ज्यादा टाइम देने के लिए कहा भी है, क्योंकि मैं जानता हूँ कि मैं भी उन मँम्बरों में से हूँ जो कि लम्बी चीज़ी तकरीर करते हैं। लेकिन मैं जर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जो रूलज आज मौजूद हैं वे हाउस आफ कामंस से डिफरेंट नहीं हैं। हमारे रूलज के मुताबिक हर एक मँम्बर को अलिम्यटर है कि अगर वह चाहे तो किसी भी बिल पर कितना ही बोल सकता है। रूल भी यह है और इस से डिफरेंट नहीं है। लेकिन मैं अदब से जर्ज करता हूँ कि जब रूलज का सवाल नहीं है जब तो सवाल यह है कि कितना टाइम बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने मुकर्रर किया है हमें उस के मुताबिक एडजस्ट करना होगा। अब वह जमाना नहीं है कि लांग आठ आठ घंटे बोल लिया करे। वह जमाना चला गया है अब हम आठ आठ घंटे बोल नहीं सकते हैं। एक जमाना था जब कि मेरे जैसा एक अदने से अदना मँम्बर जब फाइनेंस बिल पेश हुआ करता था एक दो घंटे बोल लिया करता था। वह जो बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी अब बनाई गई है उस में सब पार्टियों के नुमाइन्दे मौजूद हैं। उन सब की राय को सुन कर यह कमेटी बकल मुकर्रर करती है। इस बावते जब यह कमेटी सार्व हाउस की एक रिप्रेजेंटेटिव कमेटी है और जिन फँसलों पर यह पहुँचती है उन में मजबूत तरकीम पेश करने

की या उन को फ्लोट करने की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। मैं मानता हूँ कि बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी में हाउस के तमाम मॅम्बर मौजूद नहीं हैं, लेकिन हर एक पार्टी के नुमाइंद हैं और मॅम्बरों को हक हासिल है कि वह उस के फँसलों के अन्दर एमॅंडमेंट ले आये। लेकिन इस तरह की एमॅंडमेंट कि जिस के अन्दर हर एक बिल के वास्तु और ज्यादा वक्त मांगा गया है मैं समझता हूँ वाजिब नहीं है। अगर कोई खास बिल हो जिस के अन्दर कोई मॅम्बर यह फील करता हो कि इस के लिए और ज्यादा वक्त मिलना चाहिये और इस पर और बहस होनी चाहिये तो हम ने हाउस में दँला है और कई मर्तबा दँला है कि जनाब की तरफ से या डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब की तरफ से या जो कोई भी इस कुर्सी पर बैठा हुआ होता है उस की तरफ से इस बात की इजाजत दी जाती है। इस बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी के होते हुए भी जनाब ने, डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब ने, मैं ने, जब मैं चेंबर में था या किसी और ने जो उस वक्त चेंबर में था, मुर्करा वक्त से ज्यादा वक्त दिया है। और जो यह कहा गया है कि मजबूतग होता है.....

श्री कामत : मैं ने मजबूतग का लफ्ज इस्तमाल नहीं किया।

बंधित ठाकुर शास भार्गव : जब यहां पर हाउस में मजबूतग होता है तो प्रॉर्टेस्ट भी किया जाता है और कहा जाता है कि हम ज्यादा बोलना चाहते हैं।

जब जब कि यह कमेटी बनी है तो यही नहीं है कि इस के मॅम्बरों को ही बुलाया जाता है लेकिन खास खास मौकों पर दूसरे अशाखास को भी बुलाया जाता है। जनाबेवाला, मैं कांग्रेस पार्टी का एक मॅम्बर हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारी पार्टी की पालिसियां ज्यादा से ज्यादा आगे बढ़ें। और जच्छ कानून जल्द से जल्द पास हों लेकिन कई बार

एंसे मौके आये हैं जब कि मैं ने खुद कई बिलों के बारे में ज्यादा वक्त तलब किया है। लेकिन अगर हम हर एक मौके पर और हर एक बिल के बारे में इस तरह से एमॅंडमेंट लाने लगे तो इस कमेटी का क्या फायदा रह जाता है.....

Shri Kamath: Only for two Bills.

बंधित ठाकुर शास भार्गव : और हम किसी तरह से भी अपने आप को एडजस्ट नहीं कर सकेंगे। जनाबेवाला, इस तरह से हर बिल के बारे में एमॅंडमेंट्स लाना मेरे विचार में वाजिब नहीं है। हम ने दँला है जनाब ने या डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब ने या मैं ने जब मैं चेंबर में था अगर कोई मॅम्बर ज्यादा वक्त लेना चाहता था और रिलेवंट बोलता था, कोई नई बातें कहता था, रंपीटेशन नहीं करता था तो एंसे मौकों पर उस को काफी समबतक बोलने की इजाजत दी जाती रही है हालांकि स्पीच करने का टाइम भी मॅम्बर साहिबान की मर्जी से ही फिक्स किया जाता था। एंसे हालात में किसी ने ज्यादा टाइम देने के लिए आबजेंट नहीं किया।

इस वास्तु में कामत साहब से कहाँ कि अब जब कि सारी पोजीशन एक्सप्लेन कर दी गई है और सारी चीज उन के सामने आ गई हैं, वे अपनी एमॅंडमेंट्स को वापस ले लें और जो हाउस के नये जमाने में कनवेंशन हो चुकी है उस को उन्हें मान लेना चाहिये।

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): While I fully endorse the recommendations.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. We have exhausted already half an hour, or perhaps five minutes more than that. The only course is.....

Shri Jaipal Singh: May I seek a clarification in view of what you have said? I fully endorse the recommendations of the Business Advisory Committee. I myself have been a member

[Shri Jaipal Singh]

of it now and previously also. But there is something which you have said; although I agree with it, I feel that the House must reserve the right to make comments on the recommendations of the Business Advisory Committee when there have been lapses in that Committee.

You will remember that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs lapsed very badly last year over this question of providing time for a discussion on the Report of the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. This year.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He is going into past history which will not be relevant to the discussion of the present motion. I have already stated that every Member has a right—it is not the intention to deprive anyone of that right—but there are ways and ways of exercising the right. I am just throwing a suggestion: if any Member feels dissatisfied over the allocation of time by the Business Advisory Committee, the better course, to my mind, would be not to table an amendment to the motion but to represent the matter to the leader of his own party who was there in the Business Advisory Committee. He could then explain to him the reasons as to why a particular time was fixed up, and the matter is always open for discussion. I, therefore, advisedly said that even in this House when some time was allocated and it was felt that some more time was necessary, the result of the adoption of this motion being that it becomes the allocation order of the House, it becomes necessary to take the sense of the House, and the House can revise its view on a further representation or a further examination of the situation as it arises from time to time. That is the proper remedy, and not moving amendments and all that. That is the whole clarification which I would like to make.

Shri Kamath: May I seek a clarification as to whether those Members

of the House who are interested in this matter will be permitted to attend the meeting of the Business Advisory Committee. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Every care is taken to see that Members who are likely to be interested in a particular subject are specially invited, and if any particular Member says that he is interested in respect of a particular Bill or a particular subject, the question of inviting him to remain present at the time of the consideration will be taken into consideration by the Business Advisory Committee. The hon. Member will realise one thing, that when we meet in committees, we do not represent parties; we function as a whole House and we do what, we think, is the best in the interest of the entire House. Absolute insistence on a Member's right might lead to absolute waste of time; that also is a thing to be seen. So all these things are looked into.

Shri Kamath: May I say that this discussion, with the assurances and fresh information given, has cleared the air and served the purpose which I intended? I, therefore, do not want to press my amendment. I ask for leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

*The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.*

Mr. Speaker: Now, I come to the other amendment.

Shri Dabhi (Kaira North): I have not moved my amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I only want to know whether he wishes to move his movement.

Shri Dabhi: That is what I say...

Mr. Speaker: If he wishes to make a speech giving his reasons as to why he tabled the amendment, there is no time for it.

Shri Dabhi: No, no. In view of what you have said, I do not want to

move my amendment. But one thing I would mention. The hon. the Deputy-Speaker himself suggested that we should send in amendments.

**Shri M. A. Ayyangar:** Does he say that I suggested amendments should be moved?

**Mr. Speaker:** Let there be no discussion on that point now. What the Deputy-Speaker said is reported in the proceedings of the House, and everybody knows what it is.

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the allocation of time proposed by the Business Advisory Committee in regard to the Government legislative and other business, as announced by the Deputy-Speaker on the 26th July, 1955."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Speaker:** So this becomes the allocation of time order of the House.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** With your permission, I would like to announce the priority of business also. I wish to inform the House that Government intend to take up legislative business, for which the Business Advisory Committee has recommended allocation of time, in the following order:—

1. Further consideration of the Industrial and State Financial Corporations (Amendment) Bill;
2. Indian Coinage (Amendment) Bill;
3. Land Customs (Amendment) Bill;
4. Spirituous Preparations (Inter-State Trade and Commerce) Control Bill;

5. Prisoners (Attendance in Courts) Bill;
6. Delhi Joint Water and Sewage Board (Amendment) Bill;
7. Code of Civil Procedure (Amendment) Bill;
8. Durgah Khawaja Saheb Bill;
9. State Bank of India (Amendment) Bill; and
10. Industrial Disputes (Appellate Tribunal) Amendment Bill.

**Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad):** May I request you to direct that the Minutes of every meeting of the Business Advisory Committee be circulated to the Members of the House?

**Shri S. S. More (Sholapur):** May I request that the present schedule be circulated to the Members with the timing?

**Mr. Speaker:** The present order of priority, as stated by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, will be circulated for the information of the Members. As regards the other request of Shri Kamath, I am afraid it is very difficult to accept it. The conclusions are there and the Minutes are circulated to the Members, and the Members representing the sections of the House can always communicate their contents to all Members.

#### INDUSTRIAL AND STATE FINANCIAL CORPORATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

**Mr. Speaker:** The House will now proceed with clause by clause consideration of the Bill further to amend the Industrial Finance Corporation Act, 1948, and the State Financial Corporations Act, 1951.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Clauses 2 to 6.

Clauses 2 to 6 were added to the Bill.