

12.54 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN-
TARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR
(SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): Sir, I
beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the
twenty-seventh Report of the Busi-
ness Advisory Committee presented
to the House on the 7th December,
1978."

Besides moving the report of the
Business Advisory Committee for
adoption, I would also like to move
that the House forgo the lunch interval
and sit for transacting the business....
(Interruptions)

MR SPEAKER: I will first take up
the report of the Business Advisory
Committee. The question is:

"That this House do agree with the
Twenty-seventh Report of the
Business Advisory Committee pre-
sented to the House on the 7th
December, 1978"

The motion was adopted

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki):
The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs
has made a suggestion that the lunch
interval may be given up today. In
these matters, one of the two procedu-
res has to be followed; either the
matter is mentioned in the Business
Advisory Committee and a decision
taken — this is one of the procedures
and generally we never stand in the
way — or the Minister for Parliamen-
tary Affairs contacts the different
leaders, talks to them whether they
are agreeable to that. Neither of these
courses been adopted. And as neither
of the courses been adopted, I am
resisting the motion that the lunch
interval may be given up today. If
the normal procedure was adopted,
probably we would agree. Now that
it has been brought in without any
advance notice, as if nobody exists
here, we resist and we are not agree-
able to it.

MR. SPEAKER: I think, in a matter
like this, broad consensus is neces-
sary. If the Opposition does not want
it, I do not think, we should have
it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Dia-
mond Harbour): Sir, it is not clear
whether you are going to expunge
Mr. Stephen's utterances.

MR. SPEAKER: I have said that I
am going into the matter to see if any
rule is breached.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: How
will the press know whether anything
has been expunged or not, because the
whole thing was illegal.

MR. SPEAKER: I will look into the
matter.

12.58 hrs.

MOTIONS RE. THIRD REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES— Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now
take up further consideration of the
following motion moved by Shri
Morarji R. Desai on the 7th December,
1978 namely:—

"That this House do consider the
Third Report of the Committee of
Privileges presented to the House on
the 21st November, 1978."

I do not think we will be able to
give more than ten minutes to any
Member speaking on this motion. The
time-limit for the Members would be
ten minutes.

Shri C. Subramaniam.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM (Pa-
lani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, just now we
witnessed the atmosphere in which
we are discussing this motion. The
atmosphere is surcharged with tension,
and if I may be permitted to use the
words of the Prime Minister, the at-
mosphere is surcharged with violence.
It is in this atmosphere that we should
consider the desirability of proceeding
with this motion.

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

First of all, the report of the Privileges Committee itself is not unanimous. That point has been made. In all the matters which came up before this House, the action taken was unanimous on the basis of the Privileges Committee's report. But unfortunately, there is a heated discussion and there is difference of opinion and sharp conflict. That is the atmosphere even in the discussion. Therefore, under those circumstances, will it be wise — I would particularly request the Prime Minister to consider — that we should proceed with this and take a decision on the basis of a vote of the House. I respectfully submit, you would be creating a completely wrong precedent.

There are conflicts in every walk of life today, whether it be economic, social or political. Within the political parties, there are conflicts and tensions. It is so in every party that you may take. So, under those circumstances, should you throw another apple of discord or another apple of bitterness into the national arena, which is likely to affect not only the functioning of the Government, but the restoring of harmony and peaceful atmosphere in the country as a whole? It is from this point of view... (*Interruptions*)

13.00 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER: Please hear him; you have a duty to hear him. You may agree or disagree.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I am not interested in protecting anybody. (*Interruptions*) I am speaking what I consider to be in the interests of the country. If you don't want to listen to me, it is a different matter. I know in which direction the Janata Party Government are going. They are fast proceeding towards chaos. I don't think it should happen to this country. That is why we are all concerned; that is why I say that having been a party to the framing of this Constitution, and having been a Member of this House for such a long time, I want to plead that this should not be proceeded with on this basis.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): And your having been a party to the termination of Dr. Swamy's membership.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Subramaniam will be speaking after lunch. The House is adjourned for lunch.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

MOTIONS RE. THIRD REPORT OF
THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES
—Contd.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I made a statement that in respect of privilege, decisions have been taken on a unanimous basis. I was referring to the proceedings in this House. As a matter of fact, privileges and procedures and other things vary from House to House. I am aware that perhaps in Rajya Sabha a decision was taken on a majority basis. I am not concerned with what happened in Rajya Sabha; I am concerned with the privileges and conventions we follow in this House. When I made this appeal that it would be desirable not to proceed with the consideration of this subject, I was not making a light-hearted appeal. I have got other reasons also, because this is not a straight and simple matter in which decisions could be taken. As was pointed out, it is riddled with constitutional and legal issues and we are called upon to take a decision on these legal issues. When a point was made here that the Janata Party Members had already made up their mind, there was protest from that side saying that they have got an open mind, but from the way in which they reacted even to a suggestion from their own Member Shri Rajnarain or Shri Madhu Limaye,