

Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 3rd August, 1978, agreed (Construction of Works) Bill, 1978, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 26th July, 1978."

12.43 hrs.

RE. CALLING ATTENTION ON
VIOLENCE IN MARATHWADA—
contd.

श्री शंकरसिंह जी बखेला (कपडवां):
अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज जो कालिंग मूवमेंशन है उसमें मराठवाड़ा महाराष्ट्र के किसी भी संसदसदस्य का नाम नहीं है। एक कालिंग मूवमेंशन मॉशन 2 दिसम्बर, 1977 को एडमिट हुआ था जोकि मैंने रखा था about the Public Safety Ordinance J & K and reaction of the Government thereto.

मैं आपत्ति करता हूँ कि यह जो कालिंग मूवमेंशन मॉशन रखा गया है जिसमें डा० रामजी सिंह और दूसरे चार सदस्य हैं, उसमें मराठवाड़ा महाराष्ट्र का कोई भी एम पी नहीं है। उस समय डा० कर्ण सिंह, श्री मोहम्मद शफी कुरेशी और दूसरे माननीय सदस्यों ने प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर रखा था।

डा० कर्ण सिंह ने कहा था :

"Dr. Karan Singh I want your protection, Sir."

Here also, I want your protection. In this House, people's rights and liberties have been trampled upon as a result of this Ordinance. If you cannot give us opportunity for calling attention, I would submit that you may allow about 2 hours discussion so that everybody who wishes to say something on this shall have his say".

यहां पर मैं रिकवेस्ट करता हूँ कि मराठवाड़ा, महाराष्ट्र के जितने संसदसदस्य हैं, उन्होंने चाहे कालिंग मूवमेंशन दिया हो या न दिया हो उनको दो घंटे के डिस्कशन में मौका दिया जाये। उस वक्त होम मिनिस्टर, श्री० चरण सिंह जी थे उनसे बात हुई थी। आपने कहा था अगर होम मिनिस्टर को कोई आपत्ति न हो :

"MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Home Minister, shall we have general discussion for 2 hours on this matter?"

उस समय श्री० चरण सिंह जी ने कहा था I have no objection.

यहां भी अगर प्रधान मंत्री को कोई आपत्ति न हो तो आप कृपया, इस समय मराठवाड़ा महाराष्ट्र में जो चल रहा है उस पर दो बंटा चर्चा करने की अनुमति दें।

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: (Barrack-pore): Sir, I rise on a point of order. Rule 197 says:

"(1) A member may, with the previous permission of the Speaker, call the attention of a Minister to any matter of urgent public importance and the minister may make a brief statement or ask for time to make a statement at a later hour or date."

My objection is to the language of the Call Attention motion. I believe that in this House, when you take up the calling attention motion, it should be very carefully worded. Here it says:

"To call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs:—

"To the reported unabated incidents of violence based on caste hatred in Marathwada region of Maharashtra....."

My objection is to the words 'unabated incidents of violence based on caste hatred in Marathwada region of

[Shri Saugata Roy]

Maharashtra'. My main objection is particularly to the word 'Unabated'. 'Unabated' is not true because as you have seen that yesterday, the Students Committee had called off the strike.

MR. SPEAKER: This must have come much earlier.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: It must be relevant to-day. When you are taking it up today, it must be unabated.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point?

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Violence based on caste hatred should not be there because, after some time, people will live in peace. You should not set the precedent when you are mentioning that.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not mention anything.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: The words 'unabated' incidents of violence based on 'caste hatred' should not have been allowed.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I do not see any point of order.

(Interruptions)

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Sir, My point of order is on Rule 197 and its provisos. What happens is that a member can send two notices a day on any subject of urgent public importance and the bulletin last week made it clear to the members that they should stick to this limit of two notices per day (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order? Which is the rule that is breached?

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: I am trying to suggest to you that there is violation of a rule, and it can be changed and we need not have a discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think there is point of order. I over-rule it. I am not allowing.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: When I am on a point of order, and when I am not speaking on Marathwada issue, how can you say that you will not allow me to raise a point of order? (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER Mr. Mavalankar, your point is to make a speech and nothing more than that. (Interruptions)

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: If you say this, I will not make a speech for the whole of my life here? I take strong objection. (Interruptions)

You can say there is no point of order. I will sit down. But the Chair cannot say that I am making a speech. I will not speak a word about Marathwada or casteism. I will only speak two or three sentences on the point of order, that is, regarding Rule 197. I will not use the word Marathwada at all. I am pointing out to you that Rule 197 proviso says that a Member of Parliament cannot give more than two notices on the same day. Now, Mr. Gawai gave notice on 31st July and that notice lapsed because on the next day and perhaps for a day or two more you selected some other subjects which you rightly thought were more urgent at that time than the events in Marathwada. Later it so happened that the subject of Marathwada was brought again and again through Zero hour and through other modes of submissions in the House when you announced that you will admit a Calling Attention on this. Unfortunately, it so happened that Mr. Gawai failed to renew his Calling Attention which he should have done, but my point is once a member on any matter of urgent public importance has given a notice and then for some reason if you hold that subject for your consideration and final disposal and then decide

that a Calling Attention be admitted on a subject for which a member has already given a notice, then my submission is that that original notice by the member concerned must not be taken as lapsed but it must be kept alive so that a member giving such notice in very early stages is able to get his name ballotted with others who gave Calling Attention notice later on on the same subject. That is my submission. That is my point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chairayinkil): I want a clarification on the decision on the Motion Under Rule 184. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the admissibility of the Motion under Rule 184 is guided by Rule 187 because there is complete authority of the Speaker to decide on the Motion. Regarding the motion under Rule 184, the admissibility condition is put in Rule 186. Sir, Rule 186(1) says as follows:—

'It shall raise substantially one definite issue.'

Here is a Motion fixed for Saturday.

Notice has been given by Mr. Vasant Sathe which reads as follows:...

MR. SPEAKER: No need for reading it out.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I say this, because, I want a clarification...

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Ravi, I will clarify the position. There is some misconception. The notice was published under Rule 184. It was a mistake. The notice should have been published as a Statutory Motion. It has been published; probably you have not looked into the Bulletin. So far as that Motion is concerned it is completely governed by Section 3.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: Section 5 of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952.

MR. SPEAKER: I will read the Section. It does not give any discretion to the Speaker. It merely says:

"The Government may, but Government shall, on a Resolution passed by the House of the People..."

without giving any reason whatsoever at all. Of course, the Section is very defective, there is no doubt about it. But as the Section now stands, I don't think the Speaker has any discretion. Members can misuse that Section also. There is a possibility. Therefore, that Section may require amendment. But, as the Section stands, it is a Statutory Resolution and that Resolution does not require any definite allegation at all.

श्री मृणाल गोरे (बम्बई-उत्तर):

मेरा प्वाइन्ट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर है। माननीय सदस्य श्री शंकरसिंह जी कृपया ने जो प्वाइन्ट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर उठाया है

MR. SPEAKER: I will consider it. I will put it before the Business Advisory Committee.

श्री मृणाल गोरे : आज आप नहीं ले रहे हैं ?

MR. SPEAKER: I am not converting this. I will put the suggestion before the B.A.C.

श्रीमती मृणाल गोरे : लेकिन आज आप कालिंग एटेंशन ले रहे हैं

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. The Calling Attention will be heard to day. As for two-hour discussion, I will place it before the Business Advisory Committee. Now, we come to Calling Attention..

श्री कचवलाल हेमराज जैन (बालाघाट) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय, 193 में आज फिर लिख कर दिया है कि इस पर चर्चा होनी चाहिए, कालिंग एटेंशन से काम नहीं चलेगा।

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have been telling Mrs. Gore all the time that I will put it before the Business Advisory Committee and try to find some time for discussion.

श्री कचवलाल हेमराज जैन : फिर तो यह मामला उलट-पुलट हो जाएगा। अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह तो बहुत बड़ी बात है।

MR. SPEAKER. Order please. Now, Calling Attention. Dr. Ramji Singh.

12.54 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED INCIDENTS OF VIOLENCE BASED ON CASTE HATRED IN MARATHWADA

डा० रामजी सिंह (भागलपुर) : मैं अबिलम्बनीय लोक महत्व के निम्नलिखित विषय की श्री गृह मंत्री का ध्यान दिलाता हूँ और प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह इस बारे में एक वक्तव्य दें —

“महाराष्ट्र के मराठवाडा क्षेत्र में जातिगत विद्वेष से उत्पन्न हिंसक घटनाओं की पुनरावृत्ति के कारण जन-धन की हानि और लोगों में व्याप्त असुरक्षा की भावना के समाचार।”

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI DHANIK LAL MANDAL): Sir, it is a matter of deep concern and profound regret that several incidents of violence and lawlessness...

काई माननीय सदस्य : हिन्दी में कॉलिंग एटेंशन है, इसलिए मंत्री जी हिन्दी में उत्तर दें।

श्री धनिक लाल मण्डल : बात यह है कि अन्तिम क्षणों तक जब यह बना रहा था, तो बराबर खबरें मांगी जा रही थीं (व्यवधान) और टेलीफोन पर खबरें आ रही थीं (व्यवधान)

Sir, it is a matter of deep concern and profound regret that several incidents of violence and lawlessness have occurred in Maharashtra during the last few days over the question of change of the name of Marathwada University.

श्रीमती मृणाल गोरे (बम्बई-उत्तर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा पॉइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर है। उस दिन जम्मू और कश्मीर के बारे में जब इस तरह का सवाल आया था तो उस समय भी ऐसी आपत्ति उठायी गयी थी और बाद में यह तय हुआ था कि कॉलिंग एटेंशन पर उस समय चर्चा हो, न उस विषय पर बाद में जनरल डिस्कशन हो। इसलिए मेरा कहना यही है कि जब आप जनरल डिस्कशन आज के विषय पर अलाऊ कर रहे हैं तो फिर कॉलिंग एटेंशन पर थोड़े लोगों को बोलने देना ठीक नहीं होगा। जब इस पर जनरल डिस्कशन हो तभी सब लोग बोलें।

श्रीमती अहिल्या पी० रावनेकर (बम्बई उत्तर-मध्य) : आज इस विषय पर मंत्री जी का जवाब देना ठीक नहीं होगा। (व्यवधान)

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Chandigarh): Sir, what Mrs. Gorey has said just now is quite reasonable. In the list of Calling Attention, that is, out of 5 Members, there is no Member from Marathwada region. Tomorrow when it appears in the newspapers, the people in the Marathwada region will come to know that no Member from that region has taken part in the discussion. From the point of being responsible to the people by the Members of that region, I would request you to kindly have a discussion on this subject so that Members from the Marathwada region can also participate in the discussion. The same thing had happened in the case of Jammu and Kashmir. I think there should be no difficulty to convert this Calling Attention into a discussion to enable the Members from that region to participate in it