

[Pandit G. B. Pant]

(b) *Public Health Measures:* Due precautions are being taken so far as public health measures go. Anti-cholera vaccinations have been made and additional public health staff deputed to the affected areas. Multi-vitamin tablets to the flood-stricken people are also being supplied.

(c) *Financial and other assistance given by the Centre:* The Ministry of Food and Agriculture have authorised the State Government to draw their full requirements of rice from the Central Store in Madras. The usual formula of eligibility of the State Government to a grant of half the total expenditure incurred in gratuitous relief up to Rs. 2 crores and three-fourths in excess thereof will be applicable. The Defence Ministry has sent a Dakota on the 6th afternoon with the necessary supply-dropping personnel. This aircraft has been in operation from Tiruchirapalli airport from the noon of the 7th of December. On that day, 4 tons of supplies were dropped at five places, and it is expected that air-dropping will be increased on subsequent days according to the needs as assessed by local officials. A Devon aircraft has been made available by Headquarters Training Command for dropping leaflets at the supply-dropping zones to keep people informed of the operations. Arrangements are also being made by the Defence Ministry to supply clothing material out of the salvaged and serviceable surplus stores.

(d) *Relief from the Prime Minister's Fund:* A sum of Rs. 1½ lakhs has been given out of the Prime Minister's Fund for relief operations.

The House will undoubtedly join me in extending our heart-felt and deep sympathy to the people of affected areas in their distress and suffering and to express the hope that they will continue to bear them with equanimity and courage as they have done so far.

**Shri T. S. A. Chettiar (Tiruppur):** In view of the information that we have received that many of the educational institutions have been very greatly disturbed, may I know whether any special effort has been made to help them so that the normal work can go on as far as possible?

**Mr. Speaker:** When a statement is made in reply to a notice of "calling attention" to a matter of urgent public importance, we generally do not allow any supplementary questions.

**An. Hon. Member:** I want to make one suggestion....

**Mr. Speaker:** I know Members can put the question in the form of a point of information and all that. I think they should make all these enquiries or the Home Ministry, and they will give the necessary information. Otherwise, the proceedings will be turned into a sort of short notice question over which supplementaries are allowed.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan:** May I make one submission? We have not been given any information about loss to railway property.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Minister will do so; he will supply it outside the House to the hon. Member.

**Pandit G. B. Pant:** I have tried to make as comprehensive and detailed a statement as was possible. But I shall certainly be ready to receive suggestions from all quarters, and I shall pass them on to the State Government.

---

#### MOTION RE SUSPENSION OF RULE 321

**Shri Altekar (North Satara):** I beg to move:

"That Rule 321 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the motion that leave be

granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, namely, the Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Bill, 1955, be suspended."

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta North-East): May I rise to a point of order?

**Mr. Speaker:** First, let me place the motion before the House.

Motion moved:

"That Rule 321 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the motion that leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, namely, the Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Bill, 1955, be suspended."

What is the point of order?

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee:** My point of order is one perhaps more of propriety which I consider to be comprehended in the expression 'point of order'. Yesterday I had myself suggested that the only honest and straightforward course for Government to get out of their predicament was to move for suspension of the rules. You, however, had been listening intently to arguments made from different sections of the House, and you had reserved your decision till the 12th, suggesting at the same time that after you announce your ruling, the discussion of the different stages of the Bill, if you allow it to be introduced, would be over on the same day. Now, it would have been different if yesterday you had made up your mind after having listened to different people in the House. Since you have not given your ruling so far, I find it rather unseemly and a real infraction of the order of this House, when three eminent Members of the Government party are sponsoring a motion to suspend the rules.

I feel that this kind of precipitate action is not only an indication of the jittery nerves of the Congress Party,

but it is a reflection on the dignity of the Chair, which is the sheet-anchor of the rights of the House.

That is why I do not understand how, more you have given your ruling—since you had announced your intention of giving your ruling after listening to arguments on all sides of the House—I do not understand how the Government Party could come forward with this motion. If the Government Party had come forward yesterday early in the morning or after consulting you and securing an ascertainment of your wishes, everything would have been in order. But now things are proceeding in a fashion which is very unseemly, which is a fundamental infraction of the rights of the House that you in your dignity represent. I therefore submit that this is a matter which you should rule out of order, and other proceedings should be taken recourse to if Government really wants to get out of its predicament.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy** (Salem): rose—

**Mr. Speaker:** Let me hear those who object.

**Shri Kamath** (Hoshangabad): May I invite your close attention to rule 389 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business? It refers to a point of order raised in the House. Yesterday my hon. friend, Dr. Krishnaswami, raised a point of order—I refer you, Sir, to the official record of yesterday's debate on this motion. It says...

**Mr. Speaker:** It is fresh in our minds. He need not read it and take the time of the House. Let us dispose of this matter as early as possible.

**Shri Kamath:** He raised a point of order and you were pleased to admit it. And with your characteristic patience, you heard all sections of the House and, as my hon. friend has just said, you reserved your ruling for Monday, the 12th. Sub-rule (3) of rule 389 says:

"Subject to conditions referred to in sub-rules (1) and (2) a

[Shri Kamath]

member may formulate a point of order and the Speaker shall decide whether the point raised is a point of order and if so, give his decision thereon, which shall be final."

As I have understood this particular rule and as we have known the procedure in this House and also in the old Parliament, when a point of order is raised with regard to a particular motion before the House—the motion was for leave to introduce a Bill by the Minister and the point of order was raised with regard to that motion for leave to introduce the Bill in this House; that was the concrete point of order raised—so far as I am aware, all proceedings of the House are suspended or, may I say, postponed, till such time as you are pleased to give a decision on the point of order raised by an hon. Member in the House with regard to that particular motion. Now, this motion by my hon. friend, Shri Altekar, has been introduced, with your consent—because rule 402 says that it should be with the consent of the Speaker; so I presume your consent must have been given; otherwise, it could not have been moved. I suppose Members are aware of this rule...

**Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru):** We are aware.

**Shri Kamath:** Therefore, this motion by Shri Altekar has been made with regard to that very motion, the Minister's motion for leave to introduce the Bill. So there are two motions before you and the House—one is the point of order raised yesterday by a Member and the second is the motion now moved.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does he mean that a point of order is a motion?

**Shri Kamath:** I am sorry; there are two points before the House for decision, two points with regard to the same motion. And as far as I am aware, a point of order takes precedence over everything else in the House. Once a point of order is

raised, until that point of order is finally decided by you, all proceedings with regard to that particular motion are barred under the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business. Therefore, I would suggest that this particular motion for leave to introduce the Bill, before you give your decision on the point of order, is wholly out of order. The relevant part of your remarks at the end yesterday is this:

"However, as it is an important point, I thought I must be patient and give a hearing to all friends who wanted to say something. So, as I said, I shall be able to give my ruling on Monday, the 12th." In the proceedings, you were pleased to observe:

"In case I come to the conclusion..."—

"In case", means it is not yet certain whether you will or will not—

"In case I come to the conclusion that this is not a substantially identical Bill and, therefore, it should be permitted, then, as I have already made it clear to the House, all the further stages ..... will be taken up and will be over the same day."

Now, you may or may not allow it: you may over-rule the point of order or you may uphold the point of order. In case you uphold the point of order, then the question will arise whether this particular rule—rule 321—must be suspended—not before that. In case, you disallow the point of order, then of course, the Bill will be introduced and there will be no difficulty. So, before you give a definite ruling on the point of order, any further motion with regard to the Law Minister's motion to introduce the Bill is wholly untenable according to the rules of procedure that we have adopted, and it must be summarily ruled out of order by you, in consonance with the spirit and letter of the rules. I am aware that you are vested with

over-all powers under rule 401. But, Sir, knowing you—as we do and your anxiety all these years to see that parliamentary democratic traditions and precedents—correct and right ones—are set up in this House,—and generations to come will be guided by those,—I am sure that you, as you have always been chary and sparing in the exercise of these over-all powers, will on this occasion—as this is a very important matter of amending the Constitution; my hon. friends on this side and on the other side too, have said that this is not a matter which should be taken light-heartedly or lightly—not exercise those over-all powers at all and see to it that the spirit and the letter of these rules that you in your wisdom and the Rules Committee have framed shall be upheld and shall be followed—in truth, spirit and letter thereof.

I, Sir, will not refer to the mere technical point of notice of motion. I do not know whether it requires two days' notice or not; I do not want to insist upon that. I am perfectly satisfied if it is otherwise in order, and it may be taken up. But, as I have said, it is wholly out of order in view of the point of order raised yesterday, until you announce your decision on the point of order on Monday, the 12th.

Several Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Let me make the position clear. I have heard all these arguments and I do not propose to allow a long discussion. We had 2½ hours yesterday. I think it should be enough. I propose to hear only the hon. Law Minister with respect to what Shri H. N. Mukerjee and Shri Kamath have said and then—not give my decision—proceed further.

Shri Dhulekar (Jhansi Distt.—South): I wish to oppose the point of order.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Law Minister will do it!

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East): May I add another argument, so that that may also be answered.

Mr. Speaker: No answers to all problematical points are necessary.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee has, to my mind, very rightly said that it is not a point of order but a point of propriety, and therefore, I said that I would proceed without any ruling on the point. I cannot decide points of propriety by giving rulings.

The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar): I would only shortly say that all this trouble has arisen, and we discussed for 2½ hours yesterday, in view of a point of order which was raised. If I remember aright, and if hon. Members also remember aright, it was almost universally expressed even by those who took part in the debate by raising that point of order, that they were not opposed to anything which was contained in the Bill itself, but they wanted to oppose it on certain other grounds, according to which they said it was not proper, it was the same Bill and so on and so forth. At the end, I think Shri H. N. Mukerjee himself said that probably it would have been better if Government had come forward or asked somebody else—it is as much the duty of any hon. Member, whether he belongs to this party or that, if he really wants that something should be done for which there was very little opposition—to bring this motion. It is not the duty of the Government alone to do this; it is as much the duty of the other side which raised the point of order. Therefore, I think it was more or less suggested by the Opposition that this rule should have been waived. I do not know what is there objectionable in this motion and it is hardly expected of any Member to rise up and oppose the motion which my friend, Shri Altekar, proposes to make and which he is entitled to do under rule 402 that rule 321 may be suspended. After all, I do not know what is highly improper here. It is not as if he wants to interfere in any way with the decision that the Speaker may ultimately give. That is not Shri Altekar's idea at all. Whatever the ultimate decision of the Speaker may be, at this stage there



[Shri Pataskar]

is nothing improper in Shri Altekar making the suggestion, which he himself had made, and trying to pursue that suggestion. The shorter and better way will be to make a motion for suspension of this particular rule and then the Bill may go through. There is nothing improper in it.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know why there is this anxiety of having speeches again in opposition of this. I would call upon Shri Altekar to say in a few words as to why his is making this motion.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly):** May I point out one thing now? Having regard to the situation which has arisen, and having regard to the fact that the point of order raised yesterday is awaiting your definite adjudication, would it be proper to ask for suspension of rule 321 only? Should not the hon. mover of this motion also ask for the suspension of rule 389? I say this because I do not agree with the hon. Minister of Legal Affairs that even after this motion is made, you may give your ruling on Monday. There is nothing on which you can give your ruling and that would be making it absolutely infructuous and the point of order will be dead and gone.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member will see that rule 389 relates only to a point of order.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** When a decision is pending, which is to be given under rule 389(3), my hon. friend is putting in a motion for the suspension of rule 321, which would mean that leave would be given by the House for it and there will be nothing left of the point of order. The point of order will be dead and there will be nothing on which your adjudication will be given.

**Mr. Speaker:** That will be a matter, as Shri Mukerjee said, of propriety.

**Shri N. C. Chatterjee:** I am logically saying that with respect to our anxiety that the Bill may go through if you want really to suspend one

rule, you should also ask for the suspension of the other rule.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member is at liberty to act as he likes, but I do not think that the suspension of rule 389 is also necessary.

**Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda):** I am reluctant to make bold to differ from Shri Chatterjee because he is an eminent lawyer, but I disagree with him in this fact when he says there will be no use in announcing judgment over that point of order. If we take the analogy of a judicial proceeding, the point is raised there and the judge reserves his judgment. If the parties compromise or the party concerned withdraws his case, they are at liberty to do that, even if that judgment is not required—the judgment may not be relevant so far as that particular case is concerned. Similarly, I feel that the point of order may not be required so far as this particular issue for the present is concerned, but a point of order always relates not only to that issue for that occasion only, but it is useful also for future guidance when such a question arises. You may say that it is not immediately necessary to give your adjudication. That will be for you to say, but as has been said here by two of my friends that when this point is pending before you, there cannot be any motion so far as that is concerned, I beg to differ from that view because I feel that even if that motion may be carried now, it does not affect so far as the point of order is concerned. You may give any decision on it one way or the other. This motion is decided by the House quite independent of what might come out of your mouth on that point of order and it would not affect the subsequent decision that you have to give. It would not prejudice the conclusion that you might arrive at on it. It is quite independent and separate from that fact. Therefore, so far as I can see, there is no harm in our considering this motion independently, and it

would be for you, if you deem it proper in spite of this decision, to give any judgment or not on the point of order.

**Shri Altekar:** My object in bringing forward this motion was that the Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Bill was an urgent one and that it should get through the House as early as possible. Apart from the question of the point of order that was raised yesterday in connection with the introduction of that Bill, I thought that the objection was on account of rule 321, and, therefore, if rule 321 is suspended, the Bill can be proceeded with in this House. That was a point which I made clear in my speech yesterday. I thought that the best course under the circumstances would be, without mincing any matters, as to whether the Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Bill was in substance the same or identically the same as the Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Bill and instead of taking so much time over that, to find out a way out of the difficulty by suspending rule 321 itself. I thought that was the best course and I suggested it in my speech yesterday. Thereafter when I heard my hon. friend, Shri Mukerjee also, who agreed with the same suggestion, I framed this motion and sent it on and it is placed before the House now.

With regard to the point of order, I say that although it is no doubt a question of importance so far as this Bill is concerned, the most important question is getting the Bill passed. So far as the discussion that went on yesterday is concerned, it is of importance from the technical point of view, but we want to have the substance and not the shadow or mere form. From that point of view I have given this motion, which stands in my name, and that is the reason why I have given it. There is absolutely nothing in my mind that the dignity of the Chair should in any way be touched—absolutely nothing of the

sort—because whatever your ruling may be on that point, it is only with regard to the question whether the Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Bill can be introduced in this House so long as rule 321 stands as it is, it is restricted to that question only. The point that I have taken up is that rule 321 itself should be suspended so that all the controversy over that particular question may be stopped. From the point of view of touching the most essential and crucial point I have brought forward this motion in order that the Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Bill can be proceeded with when rule 321 is suspended.

With regard to my arguments, may I give them now, Sir?

**An Hon. Member:** Not necessary.

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy (Salem):** May I draw your attention to a precedent?

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Altekar may continue.

**Shri Altekar:** The reason why I have given this motion is that the whole discussion as regards whether these two Bills are identical and substantially the same is purely a question of a rather technical nature; that controversy is purely for the purpose of the form. What came in our way was that rule 321 would not allow such a Bill—a Bill of substantially identical nature. The circumstances that prevented the consideration of the first Bill in this House and its reference to the Select Committee were that the requisite majority of half the number of this House was not present at that particular time to vote for the motion. It was not carried because 246 were for the Bill and only two opposed and the necessary number of 250 to vote for the motion was not there in this House. That particular motion was substantially carried—I may say—with only two Members against and something like 15 other Members were outside.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I think it is opening up the whole controversy again. Let us not go into that. Hon. Member has sufficiently explained as to why he thought this course fit and he has already got the Speaker's consent to have this motion.

**Shri M. A. Ayyangar (Tirupati):** There is neither propriety nor a point of order. The point of order was that leave ought not to be granted under the rules as they stand. (*Interruptions*) Let the hon. Members not feel impatient.

The point of order was raised that under the rules as they stand leave ought to be granted. You have reserved your judgment and it is open to you to say that this is barred in which case it is not open to the hon. Members to say that notwithstanding the present rules, this rule be suspended? Yesterday itself the hon. Law Minister could have said this as soon as the point of order was raised. It was argued that this point of order has no basis; it was a new Bill and leave ought to be granted. If, however, you should take a different view, what is the position? I am making a motion for suspension of this rule 321. Hon. Members who are sitting on this side—eminent lawyers—will always argue with me that they can always plead in the alternative. We can say this is point of order—a preliminary point. If, however, you do not agree with me, I am prepared to argue the other one.

This is not a matter on which the House or any portion of the House had a difference of opinion so far as the substance was concerned. It is the absence of four Members. In those circumstances a point of order was raised that it is something and hon. Members were very anxious that nothing should be done to contravene the procedure that has been enacted or the rules. The same procedure lays down that in case such an objection is raised, the rule can be suspended. The Law Minister could have moved it yesterday; Shri Altekar could have moved it yesterday notwithstanding

the fact that you did not deliver the decision on the point of order. Now it is said that the Chair's dignity is taken away. How? You can easily say that in view of the suspension of the rule, it is unnecessary to give a ruling on the point of order. Is it as if hon. Members can tie our hands and say: you must give a ruling on the point of order?

There is another thing also. Some hon. Members said that if this was disposed of, the point of order would last for the future occasion. Hon. Members—lawyers—know that on hypothetical issues no ruling can be given. Therefore, I would earnestly request you to allow this point to be raised now and not to deliver the ruling, if the House agrees that the rule be suspended. You can give your consent if the House agrees to suspend the rule. I would earnestly request you not to give the ruling on the point of order because it is not a matter before us. You can always say: in view of the decision of this House, there is no more objection under rule 321 or 149; the objection is dropped; it is a new procedure and therefore, I am not going to give my ruling on this point of order to serve future purposes. Future points of order will take care of themselves. Shri Kamath is there.

**Shri K. K. Basu (Diamond Harbour):** The main point at issue is whether the two Bills are substantially the same.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is not the issue before us.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** My point is this. If this rule is suspended and this new Bill is allowed to be introduced then there is nothing for you to decide. We have not decided. If the rule is suspended the present provisions of the rules would be no longer there. All the sides have agreed that if one the 12th the Bill is allowed to be introduced, we shall get the Bill passed on the same day. We are also as eager to get this Bill passed. So let this motion stand over; your decision will be there and it will be much more

dignified and add to the dignity of the Chair. The judgment is reserved and the Government is asking for a change. Let us wait till the 12th. May I request that this motion be allowed to stand over till the 12th when the point is decided?

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee rose—**

**Shri S. V. Ramaswamy rose—**

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not want to hear anything now. I have heard enough and I do not want any further advice from any Member of this House on this point. The point to my mind is very simple.

In the first place, I must thank Sardar Hukam Singh for giving me the analogy which exists in the courts. When a case is argued and the judgment is reserved, the parties come to a compromise or a settlement or the plaintiff wishes to withdraw, so far as I have known, in the courts, the practice is that the judge is very happy about it. Either the withdrawal or the compromise is allowed. It is not that the judge insists and says: no; you shall not compromise and the judgement must be written. It is the usual practice.

**Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda):**  
May I say one word?

**Mr. Speaker:** There need be no further argument on this question. I am not going to allow anything now.

Here is a case in which the Government is coming with something very sensible. A private Member or a Member of the majority party—I make no technical distinctions between them—in pursuance of the suggestions made not only by Shri Mukerjee but by Shri Raghavachari, if I am right, has brought this motion. The hon. Deputy-Speaker also pointed out that the question of the dignity of the Chair does not arise. On the contrary, if the hon. Members have some sympathy for the Chair, for all the infliction of 2½ hours of yesterday and the further trouble of going through all the mass; I think they should be glad that the motion is brought and that the Chair is

spared the further troubles of going through these and writing a ruling.

1 P.M.

**What is the point that was raised?**  
No principle of procedure was involved in the point of order. The question was with respect to the determination of certain facts. After all whether a Bill is identical or not identical, any decision will be restricted only to that particular question. It cannot be a precedent for further Bills. The substantial identity of every Bill—that question will have to be examined on merits. One decision—right or wrong—is not going to be a precedent for other cases because each case will stand on its own facts. All that the Chair is called upon to decide—was called upon to decide or is called upon to decide—is whether these two Bills are identical. The Chair may take the view that they are identical and the Chair may take the view that they are not identical. The Chair may be right or the Chair may be wrong. But, how is that going to affect the parliamentary procedure? The Chair is not going to decide about the procedure generally. I was saying yesterday that the question was limited, but then it revolved itself and a good deal of thing was said. Therefore it is, that I thought it best to give my consent to this motion particularly in view of the suggestion having come from two eminent Members of the Opposition and an anxiety being shown that they are equally eager to put through the Bill this session. Now, if there is equal anxiety on the part of all to put this Bill through, I do not see why there should be any objection on this procedure. I think the motion that has been made is perfectly in order and I again repeat that I thank Shri H. N. Mukerjee for having frankly conceded that this is not a point of order but this is a point of propriety. Personally I do not feel that there is any question of propriety involved but there is scope for difference of opinion; some Members may think differently and I may think differently.

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Pandit G. B. Pant):** Where is the point of propriety on some Member of the Government having adopted a course which he considered to be proper, honest and straightforward?

**Mr. Speaker:** Ordinary thinking is different from political thinking and all I can say is that on every proposition there can be a difference of opinion. We cannot go into the minds of people and say this is right or that is wrong, this is proper or that is not proper. Everybody judges for himself. So, I will now put the motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That Rule 321 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the motion that leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, namely, the Constitution (Eighth Amendment) Bill, 1955, be suspended."

*The motion was adopted.*

#### CONSTITUTION (EIGHTH AMENDMENT) BILL

**Mr. Speaker:** Now I will put the motion moved by Shri Biswas yesterday to the vote of the House. The question is:.....

**Shri Raghavachari (Penukonda):** Sir, before you put the motion and take the sense of the House I respectfully submit that now that the motion regarding the suspension of rule 321 has been passed, you will have to dispose of your ruling on the point of order kept for decision and then only this matter can be considered and not before.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is a matter of order, the sequence in which I have to put. I thought I should better thank the Members at the end after putting the motion before the House.

**Shri Raghavachari:** Till your decision is announced one way or the other this cannot be put before the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will do that at the end. Now, I will put the motion.

The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Speaker:** Now, as suggested by my friend Shri Raghavachari I thank the Members for having spared the trouble to the Chair of going through the whole mass of proceedings. I do not propose to give that ruling now.

**The Minister of Legal Affairs (Shri Pataskar):** I introduce the Bill.

#### VOLUNTARY SURRENDER OF SALARIES (EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah):** I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Voluntary Surrender of Salaries (Exemption from Taxation) Act, 1950.

**Mr. Speaker:** The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Voluntary Surrender of Salaries (Exemption from Taxation) Act, 1950."

*The motion was adopted.*

**Shri M. C. Shah:** Sir, I introduce\* the Bill.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Speaker:** Out of 6 hours allotted for the Delhi (Control and Building Operations) Bill, 5 hours and 10 minutes have been availed of till yesterday and 50 minutes now remain for completing the clause-by-clause

\*Introduced with the recommendation of the President.