

[Mr. Deputy Speaker]

Article 96(2) provides, "inter alia", that the Speaker shall have the right to speak in, and otherwise to take part in the proceedings of the House when any resolution for his removal from office is under consideration in the House.

Rule 173 of the Rules of Procedure, "inter alia", provides that in order that a resolution may be admissible, it shall satisfy the following conditions, namely :—

- (i) it shall be clearly and precisely expressed ;
- (ii) it shall raise substantially one definite issue ;

In the light of the foregoing, the resolution should have been specific with respect to the charges. The notice under consideration refers to "rulings given by the Speaker of the House including the one on March 19, 1987, on the question of privilege and adjournment motions" It also speaks of denial by the Speakers their right to raise "vital constitutional issues and procedural issue and burning problems". It is, therefore, not at all specific with respect to the charge.

Viewed in the light of the constitutional provisions as well as the requirements of the Rules of Procedure, as mentioned above, I am of the view that it is not a matter of more technicality but one of substance. As the Speaker has the right to participate in and to vote on such a Resolution, it is only fit and proper that he must know precisely what the charges against him are so that he could reply to them. Principle of natural justice also demand the same. In as much as the charges are not specific, are not "clearly and precisely expressed" and do not raise "one definite issue" of which due notice has been given, the resolution would be 'prima facie' out of order. Also, as stated by me earlier, the notice stands vitiated by advance publicity and violation of Rule 334A.

However, notwithstanding all this, I would not like to stand between the members who have given the notice and the rest of the House. Since this happens to be a

resolution given under Article 94 of the Constitution and concerns the removal of the Speaker himself, I would leave it to the House to decide for itself whether leave should be granted to the member (the first signatory to the notice) to move the Resolution. Rule 200(2) provides that "a motion for leave to move the resolution for removal of Speaker shall be entered in the List of Business on a day fixed by the Speaker, provided that the day so fixed shall be any day after 14 days from the date of receipt of notice of the resolution". Since this involves the removal of the Speaker, today being the earliest opportunity under the rules, the matter is being placed before the House. Therefore, I now call upon Shri Somnath Chatterjee to ask for leave of the House to move the Resolution.

(Interruptions)

SHRI PRATAP BHANU SHARMA : (Vidisha) : I am on a point of order. The text of the Resolution is totally baseless and misleading. I wanted to draw your attention to

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I cannot allow any discussion now. I cannot give any ruling.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You should have raised before, not now. Please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have given my ruling. You cannot raise it now.

Mr. Chatterjee.

— — —

12.20 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE : REMOVAL OF THE
SPEAKER FROM OFFICE

(English)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE
(Bolpur) : I beg to move for leave of the House to move the following Resolution :—

"That this House having taken into consideration the Rulings of the Speaker of the House including the one on March 19, 1987 on the question of privilege and adjournment motions feels that by denying to the Members right to raise vital constitutional and procedural issues and burning problems, the Speaker has ceased to command the confidence of all sections of the House and therefore resolves that he be removed from his office."

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Before the leave is granted, they have started the debate :

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please, order, order.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SHANTARAM NAIK (Panaji) : All the discussions under Rule 193 were started by them. Which burning issue he did not allow ? *(Interruption)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to move the following Resolution :—

"That this House having taken into consideration the Rulings of the Speaker of the House including the one on March 19, 1987 on the question of privilege and adjournment motions feels that by denying to the Members right to raise vital constitutional and procedural issues and burning problems, the Speaker has ceased to command the confidence of all sections of the House and therefore resolves that he be removed from his office."

Hon'ble Members who are in favour of leave being granted will kindly rise in their places—Yes, the leave to move the Resolution is granted under rule 201 (3).

The Resolution is to be taken up for discussion within 10 days from the date on

which leave has been asked for and granted by the House. I have no objection if the Resolution is taken up today itself at 3.30 p.m. and the discussion is to be concluded by 5.30 p.m. *(Interruptions)* I think the House will agree to this.—We will take it up at 3.30 p.m. 2 hours are allotted to this... *(Interruptions)*

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI H K L. BHAGAT) : May I make a submission? We can proceed with this debate immediately and I would suggest that we dispense with the lunch hour, sit right upto 3.30 or at the most, including the reply by the Minister, by 4.0' clock and then take up this ..

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You have got the discretion to decide whether this should be taken up today ..

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is the House which has to decide.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : There is a procedural point. Does it stand to logic that one debate is to be over by 3.30 and another debate will start immediately afterwards ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You take it up tomorrow or any day afterwards.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Let the House decide it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : According to the rules, it is left to your discretion. How can the House decide it ?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have decided that it can be taken up at 3.30 p.m. today itself. Now if at all the House decides otherwise, it is left to the House. I have given my ruling. Now Matters under rule 377.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
On a Point of Order, Sir ..*(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No
Point of Order. On 377 what is the Point
of Order ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
This is a matter where you can use your
discretion...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : 3.30 p.m.
I have told you.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD
(Bhagalpur) : You have decided, not the
Minister.. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : In a way,
the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has
suggested only

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Only I
have suggested. I suggested that...

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
You never asked us.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
Does it appeal to your reason that if one
debate is going to be over at 3.30 p.m.,
then another debate will start..*(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : It is a
ruling which I have already given. No
further discussion on that now...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : please
order.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :
Kindly use your discretion, Sir. The right
of discretion you have to use. We appeal
to you to utilise your discretion.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Previously
also when it was taken up like this, the
same day discussion took place...

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Guwahati):
Let us have it tomorrow, Sir. How can we
discuss . *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
How two important matters will be discussed
today ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : This is
also a very important matter. We can
discuss it today.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
You never asked us. You took their view.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : It will be
over in two hours.....

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : We are
skipping the Lunch Hour also.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It is we
who gave the notice of the motion not they.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : They will
also participate. They have the right to
participate.....

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : One
appeal to you, Sir. When you are supposed
to use your discretion, would you not
consult both the sections of the House ?....
(Interruptions).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
You could have even called us to your
Chamber and consulted everybody about
the suitable time for that ..

*(Interruptions)***

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have
not allowed it. I am not allowing anything ..

*(Interruptions)***

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please
take your seats...

*(Interruptions)***

**Not recorded.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If on the same day we can finish, then why ask for postponement? What is the purpose of postponing till tomorrow? Tell me. Why can't we discuss it today? What is the purpose of postponing ..

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Two debates we are taking up when the notices have been given...

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI : You never asked us, you obtained their consent.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You have given the notice but not only you are going to speak...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Only the House has to decide, otherwise myself. When the House has different views, then I have to take the decision. I have decided 3.30 p.m. There is sufficient time...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I cannot understand why you want to postpone. What is this? You tell me ..

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER ; When the leave has been granted, there is no point in postponement..

(Interruptions)

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

[*English*]

- (i) Demand for a scheme for providing drinking water to various towns in the country, especially in Uttar Pradesh

[*Translation*]

DR. CHANDRA SHEKHAR TRIPATHI (Khalilabad) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the problem of water supply is

continuously increasing in the country. Increase in the population and fleeing of people from rural areas to cities has made this problem further complicated. In Uttar Pradesh, at present there are 685 cities out of which arrangements for drinking water for 566 cities have already been made and for the remaining 119 cities such arrangements are yet to be made. Even in those cities where machinery for water supply was installed some 10 to 15 years back the arrangements have become inadequate due to rapid increase in population and fast urbanisation of the cities. For this reason, it is necessary that reorganisation and expansion should be done. This will require about Rs. 525 crores but in the Seventh Five Year Plan an outlay of Rs. 156 crores has been earmarked. With this amount it is not possible to make arrangements for drinking water for the remaining cities and also port reorganisation and expansion of about 200 cities. Therefore, additional funds should be made available for water supply to cities.

I, therefore, demand from the Central Government that for the cities also crash programmes for water supply should be formulated by it, as is being done in the rural areas. In addition, a financial organisation should be set up for implementing a programme for drinking water and cleanliness drive, which may allocate funds for these items.

[*Translation*]

- (ii) Need to develop Shrangverpur Ram-Chauraghat area of Phulpur region in Uttar Pradesh as a tourist resort.

SHRI RAM PUJAN PATEL (Phulpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to draw the attention of the Government of India towards a matter of urgent public importance. Shrangverpur-Ram-Chauraghat located in the Kudihar Development Block of Phulpur Parliamentary constituency is a place of historical importance. Lord Rama while in exile, had passed one night at this place and had crossed the river Ganga from here. At present, Archeological Department is engaged in excavation of this area. It has found one strangely shaped tank which seems to be thousands of years old. In addition, many more ancient articles have