

की तरह केवल छोटे-छोटे कर्मचारियों को दंड देकर ही मामले को समाप्त कर दिया जायेगा ? यह सही है कि विदेशी मुद्रा की जो चोरियां चल रही हैं, वे ज्यादातर डालर और पाउंड आदि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा की होती हैं। हमारे पड़ोस में दुबई, बेहरिन, हांगकांग और सिंगापुर आदि कौन-कौन से देश या टापू हैं, जहाँ से इस प्रकार का तस्कर व्यापार ज्यादा चल रहा है और उसको रोकने के लिए अब तक सरकार ने क्या विशेष कार्यवाही की है ?

जैसा कि श्री वाजपेयी ने कहा है, एक सरकारी अधिकारी ने सार्वजनिक रूप से यह वक्तव्य दिया है कि पिछले दो वर्षों से लन्दन के एक बैंक में इस प्रकार की विदेशी मुद्रा जमा होती रही है। इसका मतलब है कि उसको बैंक की जानकारी है। जब एक सरकारी अधिकारी ने सार्वजनिक रूप से यह वक्तव्य दिया है, तो फिर मन्त्री महोदय को बैंक का नाम सदन को बताने में क्या आपत्ति है ?

यह जो केस पकड़ा गया है, वह एयर इंडिया से सम्बन्धित है। कुछ समय पहले बी० एम० ए० सी० से सम्बन्धित एक स्मगलिंग का केस पकड़ा गया था; हमारे देश में जो अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय वायु सेवायें काम कर रही हैं, उनके जरिये से हमारे देश में विदेशी मुद्रा और सोने आदि का तस्कर व्यापार न बड़े, क्या इसके लिए सरकार ने कोई विशेष कदम उठाये हैं या नहीं ?

श्री रामनिवास मिर्धा : मैं पुनः यह दोहराना चाहूँगा कि बैंक का नाम बताने का प्रश्न ही नहीं उठता है। किस पृष्ठभूमि में अधिकारी ने क्या कहा, उसके बारे में मैं अभी नहीं कह सकता हूँ। लेकिन जो तथ्य अभी मिले हैं, उन से पता लगाया जा सकता है कि शायद यह पैसा कहीं जा कर जमा हो रहा होगा। अभी न तो बैंक से जानकारी ली गई है, न दस्तावेजों की जानकारी है और न बैंक में जमा रुपये के बारे में जानकारी हमारे पास आई है।

इसलिए यह कहना कि बैंक का नाम आदि जानकारी मेरे पास है और मैं बताना नहीं चाहता हूँ, न्यायसंगत नहीं होगा। माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है कि केवल छोटे-छोटे अधिकारी ही पकड़े जाते हैं और दूसरे बड़े-बड़े लोग बच जाते हैं। यह सही नहीं है। कई ऐसे केसेज चलाये गये हैं, जिनसे बड़े-बड़े आदमी सम्बन्धित हैं और जिनके बारे में जानकारी इस सदन के समक्ष आ चुकी है। जो कम्पनी के मालिक हैं, उन पर भी केस चला है।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : उनके नाम बता दीजिये।

श्री रामनिवास मिर्धा : ऐसे दो, चार, पांच केसेज मैं नामों सहित सदन को देना चाहता हूँ। एक तो आर० एस० कम्बेटा का डरोस बिल्डिंग के सम्बन्ध में केस है। उसकी काफी विस्तृत जानकारी हुई है और कई लोग उस से सम्बन्धित हैं। दूसरा मेसर्स डाइसेल (प्राइवेट) लिमिटेड, बम्बई का केस है, जो कुवैत में काम करते हैं। उसके बारे में जांच की जा रही है। अन्य केस हिन्दुस्तान मोटर्स, हरिदास मूंडड़ा और सर हीरजी काउसजी जहांगीर के हैं। ये मामले बड़े पेचीदा होते हैं और उन के बारे में हर तरह से जांच करने की कोशिश की जाती है। जिन मामलों की अभी जांच हो रही है, उनका पूरा पीछा किया जा रहा है। जो भी व्यक्ति इससे सम्बन्धित होंगे, चाहे वे किसी भी स्थिति में हों, वे बच नहीं सकेंगे और उनको कोई अनुचित लाभ नहीं मिल सकेगा।

RE. DOUBLE VOTING ON THE CONSTITUTION (TWENTY-FOURTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1970

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the 4th September, you said that you would hold an enquiry into the wrong voting. We said that there were cases of double voting also. We find that nothing tangible has been done so far.

[Dr. Ram Subhag Singh]

From the papers that have been laid on the Table of the House it appears that there were wrong votings. I did not want to dispute your ruling at that time. But every time more than 4 Members recorded double voting. Later it was revealed that the votes of some Members were also recorded through tellers. (*Interruption*). I do not want to take much time. There are 5 Members who voted twice, every time, on all the Divisions on all the five times.

Therefore, I would request that this matter should not go by lapse. So far nothing tangible has been done. I request you, Mr. Speaker, to do something in regard to this matter so that the prestige of the House may not suffer.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : This is a very serious matter and I regret to say that in spite of the repeated request that we made on several occasions and later on too, through letters and personal pleadings with you, you were not good enough to follow up the promise—the promise which we understood you to make on the very next day, in response to the demand made in the House for a regular enquiry.

In your reply to me you were good enough to say that the Rules Committee had discussed this matter. But, Sir, that is not the enquiry that we felt was needed, that we had in our mind. A more serious effort should be made to enquire into the whole thing, the background to it etc. so that in future such things would not be repeated.

Even in village panchayats, panchayat samitis and so on, and various other institutions of local bodies, such things have happened and are happening. Now, if we do not take sufficiently serious notice of what has happened in this House, in different parts of the country we would be hearing more and more of such things that when in the Lok Sabha itself such things are allowed to happen and they have happened, why should anybody find fault with what is being done in the local bodies and so on.

Lest the general standard in regard to

voting in all these various representative institutions should come to be denigrated on the analogy of what has happened here. I would request you to take a more serious view of this whole matter and accede to our request that an independent enquiry should be made under your authority, through a Committee of the House, or in whatever way you would be pleased to constitute it, after consulting the leaders of various parties in this House, so that all the facts regarding what happened, about which details have already been given by the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, would be found out, and then first of all, it would be found out who those Members concerned are and how they did it and on what inspiration or with what support they did it, whether there was any force at all behind it and so on, and then the people concerned would be properly admonished, and, thereafter, what steps could be taken for the future in order to see that similar things would not be permitted and would not happen. I would like you to go into this matter of appointing the tellers also. I think the present system needs to be improved. How it has to be improved has got to be studied also.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, रूल्स कमेटी की शिफारिशें आ गई हैं। सदन उन पर विचार कर सकता है। हमारा उन से संतोष नहीं है। हम समझते थे कि इस मामले की भ्रलग से जांच की जायगी। यह पता लगाना जरूरी है कि जिन सदस्यों ने दो बार बोट दिए क्या उन्होंने असावधानी से दिया या जानबूझ कर दिया? फिर भविष्य के लिए कदम उठाना भी जरूरी है कि इस तरह की घटना सदन में न घटे और सदन में जो मतदान होता है उसके बारे में सदन के सदस्यों में या जनता के मन में किसी प्रकार का संदेह न रहे। लेकिन जो कमेटी की शिफारिशें इस बारे में हैं वह पर्याप्त नहीं हैं और मैं चाहूंगा कि इस मामले में आप फिर से गौर करें और एक नई कमेटी का आदेश दें जो कमेटी भविष्य के बारे में भी शिफारिश कर सके।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री : मेरा निवेदन

इतना हो या कि जिस प्रकार की एक घटना घटी उस ने देश में निश्चित रूप से ही हमारे इस सदन के सम्बन्ध में और लोक-सभा के सदस्यों के सम्बन्ध में एक बड़ी गलतफहमी पैदा की। रूस कमेटी ने जो सुझाव दिए हैं हम चाहते हैं कि आप हमेशा जैसे भिन्न-भिन्न पार्टियों के नेताओं को बुला कर महत्वपूर्ण निर्णय लेते रहे हैं, इसी तरह से बजाय यहाँ इस पर विचार करने के पहले अपने यहाँ इस के ऊपर निर्णय लें और फिर उसे सदन में प्रस्तुत करें ताकि हमारे सदन के सम्बन्ध में कोई गलतफहमी भविष्य में न बन पाए।

SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM (Visakhapatnam) : May I also add that many of us feel that a fuller inquiry is necessary not only to prevent but also to see that the fair name of all Members is maintained ?

MR. SPEAKER : I had a statement prepared already and I wanted to read it, but after what has been mentioned by the hon. leaders,.....

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Please read it.

MR. SPEAKER : I think I should read it so that hon. Members may know the position, and after that, I shall make a further reference.

The Statement that I had to read after the presentation of the report was as follows :

"Dr. Ram Subhag Singh, Prof. N. G. Ranga, Acharya J. B. Kripalani, and some other Members have written to me to ask whether an enquiry in the matter of double voting on the Constitution (Twenty fourth Amendment) Bill, 1970 had been conducted.

When the matter was first raised in the House on the 3rd September, 1970, I observed :

"For the future, either through the Rules Committee or any other Committee, let it be examined."

I referred the matter to the Rules Committee as it related to the rules of procedure. The Rules Committee in which almost all the Parties, Groups in Lok Sabha are represented, discussed the matter and made its commendations. The minutes of the sittings dated the 8th September, 1970, and the 18th November, 1970 of the Committee have been laid on the Table of the House on the 10th November and 26th November, 1970, respectively.

The recommendations of the Committee are before the House and it is for the House to take such action as it deems more fit."

Also, when this matter was raised, the House expressed its wish that the matter should be taken up immediately, and I said this would be discussed for future purposes, in view of the present case also, by the Rules Committee or any other Committee, if the Members so desired.

I sent Shri Shakdher, Secretary to Lok Sabha, to certain members, and at that time they concurred except Shri Ranga whom he could not meet.

The matter was referred to the Rules Committee and their Report is before the House. The Committee have said that in certain cases out of these or four members, at the time of voting on certain clauses out of four or five times, a mistake was committed here and there, on this clause that.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Some members committed it on all occasions.

MR. SPEAKER : At the time of final voting, something happened. Shri Ramshekhar Prasad Singh had sat on the wrong seat and voted. Then he got up the next day, admitted his mistake and expressed his regret in this very House.

This was considered by the Rules Committee. The Committee considered everything. They laid down a certain procedure for the future. It was recently reconsidered by the Rules Committee and that too is before the House—it is being laid on the Table today by Shri Nath Pai or some other hon. member. Meetings were held very recently again to reconsider all those questions.

[Mr. Speaker]

I was asked to reprimand-not reprimand but to warn or express my displeasure, to Shri Ramshekhar Prasad Singh. He came to my Chamber and I obeyed the directions of the Committee. That is again is circulated to hon. members.

The hon. leader said that he should have been reprimanded in this House. If he was warned in the Chamber, everything is circulated here and the press know everything, I do not think it is necessary. But if they wish that that should be repeated here, I do not mind. But certainly I have done it once. If I had been asked that it should be done only in the Chamber, I could have stood by that; I thought I had to call him to my Chamber and do it, I did it and circulated it. But I do not mind doing it here.....

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no; not necessary.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : आपने जब एलान कर दिया अध्यक्ष महोदय, तो अब छोड़ दिया जाय ।

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : That is enough. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh should be large-hearted.

SHRI RANGA : You have not concluded. I will have my say later.

MR. SPEAKER : This is the position. I will stand by the wish of the House. I think there should be complete satisfaction on this.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH : Ch. Randhir Singh said that I should be large-hearted. I am prepared to be as large-hearted as he or any other member. But there is a case when on all the five divisions, five members repeatedly mis-utilised the machine because they voted on the machine and at the same time each told the tellers : 'I have not voted; you record my vote.' This is your record which indicates it; it is not my record. Whether there was any other force operating behind that-I do not want to name anybody is what we want to know.

SHRI RANGA : I am sorry, I am not at all satisfied with the way this thing has so far been before the House. As Dr. Ram Subhag Singh has said, the whole thing is in our own parliamentary record. Whether it is five or four or three or two, anyhow certainly it is more than one. One hon. member concerned has expressed his regret in this House for having misbehaved in that manner. But what about the other four? Who are those four? We would like to know (*Interruptions*). If you find it so difficult to agree, I wish to suggest one thing. We want a regular enquiry into this matter, and if the House wants to excuse them later on, let them do so, but we must know who these four people are, why they did not, whether they did it under any inspiration or by mistake just on the spur of the moment or anything like that. It could not have been on the spur of the moment, because on all the four occasions they continued to vote and misbehave and spoil the record of this House and the reputation of this House. Is it not serious enough for you to take more serious notice of it than you have done, and not merely on your own, but on pressure, on your request to you made the very next day?

13 hrs.

I cannot understand the hesitation on the part of some of our Members to go into this matter. We wanted a regular, full-fledged enquiry into this matter, and it could be a *quasi-judicial* enquiry. And that is why we suggested that you kindly consult the leaders of all these parties and with their consent and with their advice, kindly appoint a regular, impartial enquiry and let us have all the facts. And if on the findings of that enquiry we are able to discover who those Members are, then we should be able to extract from them or welcome from them their regret and promise also of future good behaviour.

I do not know whether it was possible for the tellers to doubt the veracity of any statement that was being made by any particular Member, and if that is not possible, how can we possibly help these tellers in future to obtain proper information? All these things have got to be gone into, and we cannot very simply give it up in this way and give the impression that this Lok Sabha also is light-hearted about this matter.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुं गेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस मामले में नियम समिति को स्वामखाह अग्रचन में डाला गया, क्योंकि जब यह मामला उठाया गया उसी समय इनको कहना चाहिये था। जब स्पीकर साहब ने एलान किया कि यह प्रक्रिया का मामला है, क्या मैं इसको नियम समिति को दे सकता हूँ.....

SHRI RANGA : But the next day we did not accept it.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने उस दिन स्वयं भी कहा था कि इस मामले में कोई नहीं चाहता है कि लोक सभा में वोट के बारे में मुल्क में कोई गलतफहमी फले। नियम समिति में सभी दलों के प्रतिनिधि थे और इस मामले को जांच की गई। नियम समिति इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुँची कि इस में जो तकनीकी खामियां रहनी हैं, उस के चलते कई दफा ऐसा होता है कि यहां बिजली जलती है लेकिन वहां वोट रिकार्ड नहीं होता है.....

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : एक-प्राध बार ऐसा हो सकता है, लगातार पांच बार नहीं।

श्री मधु लिमये : हमने इसको बहुत गहराई में जा कर देखा है। कभी कभी दोनों जगह बिजली जलती है, लेकिन तस्वीर नहीं आती है; सिर्फ एक ही केस के बारे में नियम समिति को सतोष नहीं हुआ, वह था श्री राम-शेखर प्रसाद सिंह का मामला, इसीलिये नियम समिति ने स्पीकर साहब को कहा। आपने उन को बुलाया और चेतावनी दे दी। लेकिन इस समय मेरा कहना यह है कि नियम समिति के पास यह मामला भेजना ही नहीं चाहिये था। आप हाउस की दूसरी कमेटी बना लीजिये, इस में किसी को कोई एतराज नहीं है, लेकिन इस में ऐसी कोई आपत्तिजनक बात नहीं है, आप नियम समिति को सारी कार्यवाही को देख लीजिये। अगर आप दूसरी कमेटी चाहते हैं तो मैं विरोध नहीं करता हूँ, लेकिन बात को थोड़ा समझ लीजिये। इस में किस ने किस बिल के हक में वोट दिया, इस मामले को छोड़ दीजिये,

लेकिन मैं यह जरूर चाहता हूँ कि लोक सभा के किसी भी वोट के बारे में मुल्क में गलतफहमी न रहे, न सदन के अन्दर गलत-फहमी हो। आप स्वयं किसी समिति का नाम दे दें, प्रस्ताव देने का सब को अधिकार है, मोशन दे दीजिये और समिति बना दीजिये। लेकिन हर रोज़ इस तरह मे इस बात को उठाना, उचित नहीं है, इस से कोई नतीजा नहीं निकलेगा, कभी न कभी तो हमें किसी निष्कर्ष पर पहुँचना होगा। आप मोशन दीजिये, जिस कमेटी के सामने भेजना चाहते हैं, भेज दीजिये। ये लोग स्वयं ऐसा मोशन रख सकते हैं।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : पांच आदमी हैं जिन्होंने हर बार वोट दिया है...

श्री मधु लिमये : आप प्रस्ताव रखिये, हम तैयार हैं, सभी दलों के नेताओं की कमेटी बना दीजिये, हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : बनाइये।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं जांच का विरोध नहीं कर रहा हूँ, इस सदन में जितने दल हैं उन के नेताओं की कमेटी बनाइये।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह सदन नियम समिति से बड़ा है, सदन ने नियम समिति बनाई है, लेकिन नियम समिति सदन से बड़ी नहीं हो सकती यह सदन निर्णय के लिये स्वतंत्र है।

श्री रणधीर सिंह : उस में पांच का जिक्र क्यों नहीं किया गया, एक का जिक्र किस लिये किया गया, इस लिये कि एक रूलिंग पार्टी का है और बाकी उधर के हैं....

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : पांचों उधर के हैं।

श्री कमलानयन बजाज (वर्धा) : अगर आप हमारे हैं तो हमारे ऊपर एन्वयायी कराइये।

SHRI NATH PAI: (Rajapur) Mr. Speaker, after I heard you I had thought that any doubt that remained in their minds would have been removed. It has now been suggested that the leaders of the parties should be called.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : On a proper motion.

SHRI NATH PAI : That is a question of procedure. But let us see the meaning of it. Shri Vajpayee just now said that the Committee was not above or superior to the House. I entirely agree with him. Obviously, the Leader's meeting is superior to parliament !

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Nobody says so.

SHRI NATH PAI . That is the meaning; we need not have to say it in so many words. A committee of Parliament went thoroughly into it. The M.Ps. concerned were invited to give explanation. The records were checked and scrutinised. Then it found that it was in one case of a Member..... (Interruption) I assure Prof. Ranga of this. When doubts were expressed on so important an issue, I felt deeply concerned. I agree that nothing shall be done by Parliament that way. When there is any doubt, particularly on so important a matter as the constitutional amendment, when there was such deep division in the House, everything that we do must be above board and beyond the realm of doubt, both in the House and in the country. It was this abiding concern of ours that compelled us in the Committee meetings to go into the records, the photostat copies and ask for the explanation of these Members.....

SHRI RANGA : Is it in your province to do it ?

SHRI NATH PAI : I do not think it is in my province to suspect everybody and very thing. I know my province. My province is not this, that I go on doubting and suspecting every body I do not regard that my province. My province is this. I am prepared to satisfy Prof Ranga, to do every thing humanly possible, reason able and logical, to remove any doubt. Who wants to go to this Committee if we are to be treated like that ? It is

not a big honour; we give our time. You asked us. Never in fourteen years have I gone to any Committee. Your predecessor persuaded us to go to this Committee and said; come and give us your time. What is it that we did ? There was a doubt. Did we dismiss it summarily. Were not explanations demanded from Members concerned ? Were not the records called ? I want to tell Prof, Ranga. We did two things. Unless he wants to go on nursing a prejudice about it, he will understand it. There should never be any doubt in future. Under your guidance the Committee evolved a totally foolproof method or recording our vote and the House, I am afraid, did not give that consideration to the new methods submitted by the Committee, which it deserved, we wanted every Member to write in his own hand-writing and give the paper to you so that there is no possibility of any misunderstanding or mistake over it. In its wisdom the House rejected it....(Interruptions) I do not know.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप को वाजपेयी जी पूरी जानकारी नहीं है, उस दिन श्री वासुदेवन नायर चेयर में थे, लेकिन हाउस ने उस को नहीं माना ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उस दिन यह बात हो रही थी कि मेम्बर्स अपनी सीटों पर खड़े हो जायं ।

श्री मधु लिमये : ऐसी बात नहीं थी, रूलज़ कमेटी की सिफारिशों के अनुसार....

श्री नाथ पाई : देखिये, इतने सजग मेम्बर हैं, उनको भी जानकारो नहीं है कि क्या सिफारिशें थीं ? सिफारिशों को किसी ने सोचा नहीं, गौर नहीं किया, ध्यान नहीं दिया और उन को यहाँ पराभूत कर दिया गया । यह आपका एतराज है, हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है ।

I am not quarreling about it. The two things were, what about the future, and then, what about the past. With regard to the past, the records were examined. Everything was evaluated, and it was the unanimous decision of the Committee; there was no difference of opinion in the Committee.

Every party is represented very adequately. A very able Member called Mr. Lobo Prabhu who takes his duty very seriously, contributes to the best of his ability to the deliberations of the Committee. I am sorry he is not here.

Then the Committee took the decision with you; and it was then agreed. Is it part of our duty to prevent mistakes in the future, or to humiliate a Member when he says that he has committed a bonafide mistake and apologises to the House and apologises to the speaker himself, saying, "I am very sorry that it was done?" After that, the matter was regarded by the Committee as closed. But in order to prevent mistakes in future Mr. Vajpayee, a new process after due deliberation was evolved. It was the wisdom of the house not even to consider it, but to reject it. We do not lament it. It is up to the House, as you pointed out. (Interruption)

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: There was no reason why he should tender his apology again. (Interruption)

SHRI NATH PAI: May I point out to Shri Vajpayee that I take his objection very seriously. आपको उसकी जानकारी नहीं है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: मेरी जानकारी है कि वह हाउस के सामने ठीक तरह से रखा नहीं गया। क्या नियम समिति की सिफारिशें इस प्रकार से रखी जाती हैं? नियम समिति की प्रमुख सिफारिशों पर अलग से सदन को विचार करने का मौका मिलना चाहिए।

श्री नाथ पाई: और तरीका क्या हो सकता है? जो तरीका आज अपनाया वह तरीका उस दिन अपनाया गया था।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: नियम समिति की सिफारिशों पर सदन विचार करे।

श्री नाथ पाई: आप उस पर विचार करें लेकिन जिस तरह से आज की रिपोर्ट आपके सामने आपकी स्वीकृति के लिए रखी गई

उसी तरह से वह रिपोर्ट आपके सामने रखी गई थी। आपने सौचा नहीं, पढ़ा नहीं तो कुसूर किसका है? (व्यवधान)...

It think there has been agitation without any reason. (Interruption) Of course, I am not opposing it. If Prof Ranga wants the matter to be reopened, he is most welcome to do it. I am not to say that it is closed. But in fairness to the Committee and to the Members concerned, I submit that the Committee had thoroughly gone into the matter. It is up to you to respect our Judgment or not. We do not want to add anything. But if Prof. Ranga wants a post-mortem on the findings of the Committee, I am not going to say no. Let the Committee find out a second time.

SHRI RANGA: I want to make it clear that I am not concerned with the Committees. My objection was that the Committee should have been charged with this task at all. (Interruption) Anyhow, you were good enough to ask them to do it. I am very unhappy about it. but at the same time, what I want is that another Committee should be appointed not only to study the facts but to go into what has already been indicated. I am not passing any judgment on that I am not concerned with them at all. I am only concerned with my appeal to you and to the House through you. (Interruption)

श्री स. मो. बनर्जी (कानपुर): श्री वासदेवन नायर जिस दिन चेयर पर थे उस दिन उन्होंने रूल्स कमेटी का यह सुझाव रखा था और यह पूछा था कि क्या लाबी में जाकर वोट दें। (व्यवधान).....

अध्यक्ष महोदय: एक टाइम में एक मेम्बर ही बोलें (व्यवधान)....

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा: अध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन ने रूल्स कमेटी के सामने यह मामला भेजा। उसने तमान परम्पराओं को और जो पहले का इतिहास था उसको देखा और फिर उसके बाद एक नतीजा निकाला और वह आपके सुपुर्द किया गया। आपने सदस्य को बुलाकर

[श्री शिव चन्द्र भा] :

जो कुछ कहना था वह कह दिया। इस तरह से बात खत्म हो गई लेकिन ये उस बात को फिर दोहराते हैं। इससे साफ जाहिर होता है कि ये विनिटमाइजेसन को निति को अपनाना चाहते हैं। (व्यवधान) यह बात खत्म हो गई थी लेकिन देश में इस तरह की कोई गलतफहमी पैदा न हो उसका हमें खयाल रखना चाहिए और भविष्य के लिए कुछ न कुछ करना चाहिए।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I remember what happened on that day. You really took the House into confidence twice or thrice and whatever doubts arose after seeing the photostat copy, you cleared them. In spite of that, when certain doubts were expressed by the leader of the Swatantra Party and others, you referred the entire matter to the Rules Committee, though we did not want it, because we have been here for 14 years and we do commit mistakes. The main point is whether the mistake was deliberate and wilful. You referred the matter to the Rules Committee. Those hon. Members who were found to have committed mistakes went to you and apologised. The committee accepted that. The committee also suggested that in future people should go to the lobby and the votes should be recorded. After that, when this question came up, Mr Vasudevan Nair was in the Chair. Mr. Vajpayee was not present. The Chairman put it to the House whether we should resort to the new practice for voting or not. The entire House thought it was an aspersion on the hon. Members and we rejected it. When it was put to vote, by a consensus, we said that the present practice should continue. I am sorry, Sir. It is nothing short of witch-hunting. They are after their pound of flesh for political purposes.

SHRI RANGA : I take strong objection to it. For political purposes, are we to understand that these guilty people have behaved in that shameless manner ? (Interruptions.)

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam) : When the Rules Committee met, I was invited by you. All these doubts now

expressed were thoroughly gone into there, I am afraid the hon. Members who have raised this question have not gone through the minutes attached to the report. This is not first occasion when this sort of thing happened. Previously on many occasions members have sat and voted from wrong seats. I do not want to mention the names. On one occasion a member belonging to the Congress (O) voted from a wrong seat. Later on it was corrected in the footnote of the debates. The same thing happened with a Jan Sangh member on another occasion. So, this is not the first occasion it has happened. It is just by mistake that they have voted from wrong seats. About the four persons who were voting again and again from the wrong seats on each clause on that day, in one seat the light was not burning. When a division takes place, there are three processes. A light burns in the seat. A light burns on the board there and then the vote is recorded in the photo copy. When the light is not burning in the seat, member does not know whether the vote has been recorded or not. (Interruptions). Only now, after the Rules Committee met, the division numbers have been mentioned on that board there. At that time, it was not there. This is what had happened. Because the light was not burning, the name was given. This was not the first occasion; people belonging to different parties had done the same thing and the correction was made.

It was also pointed out in the Rules Committee by you that if these corrections affected the results in an adverse way, you took them into consideration before announcing the result. That was made amply clear. All the Members representing different parties in the Rules Committee were satisfied then. Now is it open for the House and the leaders here to say that they do not accept what hon. Members, who represent them in the Rules Committee, did ?

Again and again it is said here that they voted shamelessly. It is a very serious reflection. This was thoroughly gone into by all the members representing different parties in the Rules Committee and they unanimously came to that conclusion. It is for the House to accept their report or

not; that is a different matter but we should not cast aspersions on members and also on the Rules Committee.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Nobody has cast aspersions.

SHRI SEZHIAN : Just now it was said shameless.

SHRI RANGA : Why do you take shelter behind it ? We have never said anything about the Rules Committee.

SHRI NATH PAI : To accuse of design is the worst accusation. You said that it was done by design.

SHRI RANGA : I said about those Members who had voted in the wrong way and not about your Members on the Rules Committee. You find out from the records. I had made it very clear that I was not satisfied with your decision to send it to the Rules Committee. Please do not take any offence. I wanted you to appoint another committee... (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER : When it was brought up here, I mentioned it very clearly that I would be sending it to the Rules Committee if the House said. Not a single dissenting vote came. But even before that I made it very sure to consult everybody. Except, unfortunately, for Shri Ranga- I am very sorry, he could not be contacted- all others were consulted. I assure Professor Ranga that we considered each and every thing dispassionately. (Interruption). I consulted Dr. Ram Subhag Singh also.

श्री मधु लिमये : उनको तो कमेटी चाहिये नियुक्त करिये ।

SHRI NATH PAI : I propose that a committee headed by Professor N. G. Ranga be constituted and he be authorised to nominate the other Members. We shall accept the findings of the Committee, at least I will do.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : We second it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I move an amendment that there should be a one-man committee headed by Professor Ranga.

MR. SPEAKER : Are you quite serious ?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH) I would like to say that I agree with some of the hon. Members who have spoken, like Shri Nath Pai, Shri Madhu Limaye and Shri Sezhiyan, that this matter was gone into very carefully by the Rules Committee having been appointed with the concurrence of the House by you and it had been found that there had been a mistake. An hon. Member was good enough to come and apologise before the House.

SHRI RANGA : What about the others ?

SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH : It is the height of vindictiveness to go on saying that it is shameless and all that.

Of late I have noticed-I wish the House to forgive me-that in respect of decisions taken in important committees where all parties are represented, in the House questions are raised about the *bona fides* of such committees. The committees cannot function if they are to be treated like this.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba) : Sir, I am one of those who voted against the Constitution Amendment Bill. But if the matter was referred to the Rules Committee and I know it was referred to the Rules Committee in the House by you and the Rules Committee has gone into it, it is not necessary for my friends who want to question the decision taken by the Committee to again place the particular matter before the House. I am one of those who do not know what exactly happened in the Rules Committee. Let the papers be circulated. Let us look into the papers rather than somebody coming to some conclusion from some quarter. This is really trying to misunderstand each other. I do not understand how the House should function in this particular matter. Are we going to take decisions only partywise in a matter which concerns the whole House. Therefore, I request everyone concerned not to debate the matter without looking into all the necessary papers. May I suggest, let all the necessary papers be circulated and let the Members look into

[Shri Dattatraya Kunte]

them ? Otherwise, what is going to happen is that no Member would like to be a member of the Committee. At least, I would not like to be a Member of the Committee. I remember, on one occasion, when the Select Committee of which I was a Member had come to a certain conclusion and came to this House wanting an extension of time for legitimate reasons, we were criticised. I wanted to say something at that time. You were pleased to make certain observations. Do you want us to say that we do not want to become Members of the Committee appointed by the august House ? Let that situation not arise.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, the papers will be circulated.

SHRI NATH PAI : The papers have been circulated.

MR. SPEAKER : If any Member has not received.....

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE: I have not received the papers.

MR. SPEAKER : The papers will be circulated. I think, some way will be found out.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Prof. Ranga should withdraw whatever he has said about the Rules Committee. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI RANGA : I have not said anything about the Rules Committee. I was only dealing with the Speaker as to the manner in which he dealt with the matter. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond-Harbour) : Sir, about 500 employees of the *Basumati* have been affected by its closure. This matter was discussed in the Rajya Sabha yesterday. Will you be kind enough to allow a discussion in this House tomorrow ? (*Interruptions*).

13.28 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Annual Report of Haryana Agro-Industries Corporation Ltd., Annual Accounts etc. of Annual Welfare Board, and Notifications under Essential Commodities Act.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI S. C. JAMIR) : On behalf of Shri Annasahib Shinde. I beg to lay on the Table :

- (1) A copy of the Annual Report of the Haryana Agro-Industries Corporation Limited Chandigarh for the year ended the 30th June, 1969 along with the Audited Accounts and the Comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-4390/70*].
- (2) A copy of the Annual Accounts of the Animals Welfare Board, Madras for the year 1968-69 along with the Audit Report thereon (Hindi version)- [*Placed in Library. See, No. LT-4391/70*].
- (3) A copy each of the following notification under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 :-
 - (i) G.S.R. 586 (Hindi version) published in Gazette of India dated the 5th September, 1970 rescinding the Inter-Zonal Wheat and Wheat Products (Movement Control) Order, 1969, published in Notification No. G. S. R. 997 dated the 16th April, 1969.
 - (ii) The Rajasthan Foodgrains (Restrictions on Border Movement) Amendment Order, 1970 (Hindi version) published in Notification No. G. S. R. 587 in Gazette of India dated the 5th September, 1970.
 - (iii) The Southern States (Regulation of Export of Rice)