

12.50 hrs.

**STATEMENT BY MEMBER RE:
TOKEN STRIKE OF RESIDENT
DOCTORS IN MAJOR HOSPITALS
OF DELHI**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now Mr. Paswan Statement under Direction 115.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (New Delhi): I am on a point of order. You have allowed Mr. Paswan, under Direction 115, to make a statement and thus given an opportunity to the hon. Minister to correct his reply, in regard to the receipt of a memorandum submitted by the Association of Junior Doctors in Delhi I had given notice of a motion of a breach of privilege against the hon. Minister on the same subject.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): We are the 3 persons concerned—Paswan, Vajpayee and myself.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I do not know why the notice to raise the question of breach of privilege was not allowed by the Speaker.
14.00hrs.

The question is whether the Minister misled the House deliberately or he committed a mistake inadvertently. The point is that the same matter is being allowed under direction 115 while the motion of breach of privilege should have received precedence over this statement under direction 115.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is that rule that permits you to state that when a motion of privilege is there, this should not be discussed under rule 115?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: A direction can under no circumstances.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Another point is that the Speaker has not permitted the privilege motion it has not been permitted. Therefore, this is not correct.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What is not correct?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are raising a point of order. This is not correct because the Speaker has not permitted that privilege motion.....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You try to understand me, Sir.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER ...therefore, that question has been solved.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The Speaker did not explain why the privilege motion was rejected.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has not permitted the privilege motion.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: On what grounds?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I rule your point of order out of order.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: On a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Under what rule?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Under rules 222 and 223. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Are you raising a point of order? Under what rule?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Under rule 376. My submission is that in the House of Commons, the Speaker never speaks. In this House, the Speaker always speaks. This is the trouble...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: But the Deputy-Speaker never speaks.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: My submission is.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Therefore, you are not raising a point of order? You are making a submission?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You put it anyway you like; you put it any way it satisfies your mind. My submission is that a direction cannot supersede the provision of the rule unless a direction rectifies the rule in the

Rules Committee. The force that remains in a direction is subordinate to the force that is in the rule. Unnecessarily, we are curtailing the power of Parliament and the rules made by the Rules Committee of this House. Kindly do not lose sight of the fact that three of us gave notice of a motion of breach of privilege under rules 222 and 223 and that has been watered down, scuttled and reduced into a statement under direction 115. A deliberate attempt to mislead the House has been converted into a mistake. The House is also denigrated. I am very happy because we do not believe....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I hope the hon. Member is not casting any aspersion on the Chair.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am casting aspersion on the whole House. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Then nobody can save you. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Never; nothing more can be done to us. Let it be placed on record that this way the Minister should not be protected by the Chair.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Am I not entitled to know on what grounds my motion of privilege has been rejected?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The privilege motion has already not been allowed by the Speaker.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: On what grounds?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not fair, Mr. Vajpayee....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What is not fair?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Speaker has taken a decision. You should not ask the same day...

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: The same matter is being raised under direction 115. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Speaker has given a decision. To ask him the...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You are the Chair...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would suggest that you go to the Speaker in his Chamber and discuss it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There is another thing. I had also given notice under direction 115. Now, I am told that I will not be allowed to make a statement because only one Member is allowed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is also the prerogative of the rule and also of the Speaker. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Mr. Vajpayee should understand that the Ruling Party cannot afford to have his political influence increased in the Capital of Delhi.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What will happen if two Members give the notice at the same time? Will they not be allowed? In case of the privilege motion also, more than one Member is allowed, why not in this case also?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: One Member has been allowed. How can another Member be allowed on the same subject?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Shall I give you a precedent? When question of privilege is sought to be raised by Members in this House, on a number of occasions more than three Members had given the privilege motions. For instance, there is the famous case of privilege in which the Prime Minister was sentenced to imprisonment. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu had raised the issue; Shri

Madhu Limaye had raised the issue, and a number of others were there; each one of them was allowed to make a statement in this House and it was the most important issue of privilege in the history of this parliamentary democracy. If that can happen in relation to that privilege motion, why should it not be permitted in the case of direction 115? I think on that ruling should be given.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You cannot expect a ruling now on a decision taken by the Speaker; therefore, all the views expressed here shall be communicated to the Speaker.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Under what rule you are shirking responsibility? Under what rules?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Under your protection...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is outside... (Interruptions) You are the Chair, and we know only one.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: A point of order was raised by Mr. Vajpayee and I have already ruled it out of order. On the privilege issue, when the Speaker has given a decision, I do not want to comment on it and give any ruling on that. I will not allow anybody to raise an issue on which the Speaker has already given a decision.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am not saying...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is in continuation of that privilege motion?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am not requesting you to give a ruling on the ruling of the Speaker. All that I am saying is that when you are in the Chair, you have all the responsibilities of the Speaker...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: But not on an issue on which the Speaker has already given his decision. You must be fair to me, Mr. Dandavate, and a

democrat also. I should not give any decision when the Speaker has already given a decision.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has not given.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In relation to that, you cannot even open that subject. It is contempt of the House...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He has not given any ruling. Will you permit us? Now, the Speaker has not given any decision... (Interruptions). All that I say is, kindly do not make any observations by which we will not be able to get any ruling from the Speaker. That is all that I am saying. We will raise the issue with the Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are speaking one inch above the Chair... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Any discussion on the privilege motion which has been disallowed by the Speaker..

SHRI K. A. RAJAN (Trichur): I am one of those who had given a privilege motion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It has already been decided.

SHRI K. A. RAJAN: On that day, a letter was received signed by a joint secretary on a certain issue, and the Members of the house took objection to the procedure, and it was raised in the House...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, no. Now, Mr. Ram Vilas Paswan to make a statement under Direction 115.

श्री राम विलास पासवान (हाजोपुर): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं लोक सभा अध्यक्ष के निर्देश 115 के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित वक्तव्य देने की अनुमति चाहता हूँ—

दिनांक 18 जून, 1980 को दिल्ली के प्रमुख अस्पतालों के रेजिडेंट डाक्टरों की सांकेतिक हड़ताल के सम्बंध में एक व्यानाकर्षक

श्री रामविलास पासवान

प्रस्ताव के दौरान मैंने स्वास्थ्य मंत्री जी से यह प्रश्न पूछा था :-

"5 तारीख को स्वास्थ्य मंत्री के नाते आप को मेमोरेण्डम दिया गया या नहीं।" मेरे इस प्रश्न के बारे में आप ने भी स्वास्थ्य मंत्री जी से उत्तर देने के लिये कहा। इस पर मंत्री जी ने पूछा—whose memorandum मैंने प्रश्न पूछा—5 तारीख को फेडरेशन आफ जूनियर डॉक्टर्स आफ देहली की तरफ से आप को मेमोरेण्डम दिया गया है या नहीं?

इस पर मंत्री जी ने उत्तर दिया—

"I have not received it... Sir, the Federation of Resident Doctors have never given any notice or demands. So the question of settlement on that does not arise here."

मैंने बाद में पता किया तो मालूम हुआ कि यह मेमोरेण्डम मंत्री महोदय के कार्यालय में 5 जून 1980 को प्राप्त हुआ और इसकी रसीद ली गई।

अतः इस से स्पष्ट है कि स्वास्थ्य मंत्री ने सदन के समक्ष गलत बयान दिया है। अतः आप से अनुरोध है कि आप मंत्री महोदय को निर्देश दें कि वे इस बारे में वकनव्य दें तथा सदन से क्षमा मांगें।

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND HEALTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): It may kindly be recalled that the Calling Attention Notice was "to call the attention of the Minister of Health to the reported token strike by the Resident Doctors in major Hospitals in Delhi on 16-6-1980" and I made a statement about the token strike by the Resident Doctors on 18th June, 1980. In the course of the questions by the Hon'ble Members of Parliament and my replies to them, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, M.P. while expressing concern about the demands of the Resident Doctors, asked whether I had received any memorandum of the Junior Doctors Federation of Delhi on 5th June, 1980. Since the Calling Attention and my statement and the questions of all the previous members who asked the questions were concerned mainly on the token strike of the Resident Doctors, on 16th June, 1980, I believed that the Hon'ble Member's question was about some memorandum of the Resident Doctors relating to token strike and quite innocently

replied in the negative of the receipt of such a memorandum.

Since the point was raised by Members, I had a thorough search made and found that a memorandum by the Junior Doctors Federation had been received in my office. In the circumstances I express my sincere regrets for the incorrect reply to a supplementary which was inadvertently given.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: Now a clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No. I am not permitting you.

I am not permitting anybody for clarification.

14.14 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: SHRI Chandradeo Prasad Verma. The hon. Member is not present.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: He is in hospital.

(i) NEED FOR EARLY COMPLETION OF KARAMCHAT DAM PROJECT IN BIHAR.

श्रीरतलाल प्रसाद वर्मा (कांडगमा) : केन्द्र सरकार और बिहार सरकार ने रोहतास जिले के दक्षिण भाग को विशेषतः चेनारी, शिवसागर, भगवानपुर, चैनपुर, भुभुवा, चांद दुर्गावती, मन्दाइनग्रा, कुदरा, रामगढ़ एवं सामाराम आदि प्रखंडों के कृषि क्षेत्र की पूर्ण सिंचाई हेतु 45 50 करोड़ की लागत में बनने वाले कर्मचट बांध परियोजना को स्वीकृत किया। करीब तीन लाख एकर की सिंचाई होने के लिये यह परियोजना सक्षम सिद्ध होने वाली थी।

कर्मचट बांध परियोजना का शिलान्यास भू० पू० प्रतिरक्षा मंत्री श्री जगजीवन राम ने जून, 1976 में वर्तमान एवं तत्कालीन मुख्य मंत्री डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र जी की उपस्थिति में किया था। तत्पश्चात् करीब 12 करोड़ रुपये का निर्माण कार्य सम्पन्न हो चुका है। कई नहरों की खुदाई भी माथ-2 चल रही थी। अधिकारियों एवं कर्मचारियों के लिये बड़े पैमाने पर कालोनियां बन चुकी हैं। अभी भी कर्मचारियों पर लाखों रुपये मासिक वेतन-भत्ता उन्हें बैकार बैठाकर अप्रव्यय किया जा रहा है।