

is aware of the fact that by an Ordinance, the Delhi University has created an institution of Councils. Therefore, all the basic and major decisions in any college are taken in consultation with the Council of the College, broadly, with all the teachers.

A word has been said about democracy. My difficulty is that of a teacher. I had heard till now and understood that democracy means the rule of the people. In this country, the people have chosen to rule themselves through their elected representatives who are sitting here and the other House. Parliament collectively represents the principle of democracy. Now, I cannot understand what is the reference to democracy insofar as the administration of the university or a college is concerned.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Democratisation.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : That is what I am trying to understand. Democratisation means greater control and vigilance being exercised by the elected representatives of the people. If the hon. Member would bear with me, I want to show him the respect which is due to him not only as the hon. Member of this House but as a leader of a party. All that I was trying to submit is that we are trying to involve the entire teaching community with the process of decision-making at as many levels as possible. For example, there is the question of framing of syllabus, who is to teach that syllabus, how are examiners to be appointed, how are research subjects to be allotted and things like that. In the processing of running a college or a university department our whole attempt is that as many people as possible should be involved. That is the principle which has been explained at some length by the Gajendragadkar Committee and which has been accepted by the Government.

श्री राम कंबर (टोक) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो दिल्ली विश्वविद्यालय में कानूनों की काउन्सिल बनायी गयी है इस के लिये अध्यापकों में बड़ा भारी डर बैठा हुआ है और वह डर इसलिये है कि उन को इस बान का खतरा है कि हमारा नाता यूनिवर्सिटी से हटा दिया जायेगा। इसलिये मैं प्रश्नना चाहता हूँ कि उनका नाता क्या हमेशा के लिये यूनिवर्सिटी से जुड़ा रहेगा और वह टूटनेगा नहीं ?

प्रो० एस० नूरुल हसन : जनाबबाना, मैंने जो अपने बक्तव्य में यह कह दिया था और इसको बिल्कुल स्पष्ट कर दिया था कि न सिर्फ गवर्नमेंट की राय में और यहां के अधिकाधिक्यों की राय में यह नाता टूटना नहीं चाहिये बल्कि वह और मजबूत होना चाहिये। अगर कोई कोशिश की जायेगी इस नाते को तोड़ने की तो कम से कम यूनिवर्सिटी की एक्जिक्यूटिव यह नहीं चाहती है कि नाता तोड़ें और गवर्नमेंट भी इस को एक रेट्रोग्रेड स्टेप समझती है।

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Is it a step in delinking colleges from the University ?

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : An assurance by a Minister in the House is binding.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : What about the Statute ? I have brought so many papers. But, I am sorry, the ballot did not favour me.

12.41 hrs.

RE. PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul) : On a point of submission regarding Press reports connected with certain proceedings of the House—some disquieting feature. It does not add to the dignity of the House or to the esteem of the House. Certain unfortunate things were said or reported to have been said here. I am not sure

[Sh. N. K. P. Salve]

whether they are part of the proceedings or not, and yet they have appeared in the Press. This does not add to the dignity of the House or to the esteem of the House.

MR. SPEAKER : I did not hear, but I read in the papers.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : My submission is this. Sometimes proceedings do take a turn which is a little unfortunate. In rash moments we say many things which we should not like to say in our cooler moments and for which we may even extend our apologies. (Interruption) Whatever it is, every one needs to be responsible when it comes to the dignity of the House. It is my respectful submission that, under such circumstances, whenever there is a scuffle like this, the proceedings might be properly scanned and anything which you find in the proceedings to be objectionable—the report of which to the Press is likely to derogate the esteem of the House—might be removed from the proceedings. This is my respectful submission, Sir.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : I did not find anything objectionable. Whatever we propose to do, whatever is said by the hon. Member of that side, it should be done in accordance with the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior) : There is no question of censoring the proceeding afterwards if something has turned objectionable. Then and there it should be rectified.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : There is an editorial in the *Indian Express* which quotes from May's *Parliamentary Practice*....

MR. SPEAKER : First let me answer him.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central) : The word used by him was 'scuffle'...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : When I referred to some 'scuffle' I did not mean physical scuffle, I referred to verbal scuffle.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE : If you want to qualify it with 'verbal', it is alright. This should not be part of the record, otherwise, future generation will say that in this House there was a scuffle. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER : In the heat of the moment sometimes many things are said and many things are done also. Whatever it is, it will remain there. I appreciate what you said. But so many things are said ; some people may like it or not ; even Speaker may like it or not ; let it remain—how they think about it. So far as newspapers are concerned, that is a very brief report. Sometimes the Pressmen cannot help it. Even while reporting me, when I said to Mr. Mishra that there is a convention not to raise points of order during the Question Hour, that was deleted. Only one thing has come. But I don't mind it.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : That is the prerogative of the Press.

MR. SPEAKER : Unless something very unparliamentary comes—of course, we don't feel happy at many things, after all we have our liberty and the Press has its own liberty—so unless they go out of certain procedures

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kajhundi) : Sir, if there is anything unparliamentary spoken, then only it should be expunged. Otherwise, there should be verbatim recording...

MR. SPEAKER : That was not my observation.

SHRI P. K. DEO : . . . and it is for the future to judge how this House behaved. That is why, in the British House of Commons . . .

MR. SPEAKER : Don't compare us with the British House of Commons.

There I don't agree. They do many things which we do not do.

SHRI P. K. DEO : . . . the British Hansard is being recorded not by the House of Commons Secretariat but by somebody else, by a third party.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East) : I submit that whatever be our regrets or any other kind of feelings in regard to things said in this House, the record, as you have said very clearly, should remain a faithful record of whatever has happened. In the House of Commons a Member was hauled up before the Committee of Privileges for having said that he had not been paid by the country in order to function in an idiotic circus. That was the description which he made of the House of Commons. That expression was not deleted, not expunged by the person concerned was made to appear before the Committee of Privileges. There was nothing very drastic done about it.

So, even in the House of Commons, the House is described by some people as an idiotic circus and in this country if a member as well as the people outside in the country come to think of it that way and if this is the state of things, we should have no compunction about it. But the record should be a faithful record.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : I have made myself very clear on the point. We say so many things in the heat of the moment which we would not have liked to say if we

we were cool and composed and we would like to express our regrets for the same; and should ever a Member like to do it he should be allowed to do it. Because, in the interests of the dignity of the House, if such things go to the Press, it is very unfortunate, it creates an impression which does not add to the esteem of the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : The glory of the House will remain in its complete freedom of speech. That is what I would say To-day the Press has very faithfully reported. It has given a new idea to the people that the Lok Sabha is at least functioning. What is wrong in that? The Press has done a good job.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) : Sir, there is no intention whatsoever to detract from the tenor of the speeches made in the House. But what I want to say is, and I would like to go on record expressing this, that some Member or a certain Member spoke about you, that you were acting or behaving like a policeman . . . (Interruptions) It has come in the Press also . . . (Interruptions) We would like to say that it does not leave a good taste in your mouth. It does not leave a good impression also among the public . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : He did not say that. He said, 'you are the Speaker of the House. You are not a policeman.'

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : This is also a reflection on the Chair . . . (Interruptions) on the honour of the Chair at least . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka) : Whatever has been said must go on record. If it is improper, steps may be taken against the member.

MR. SPEAKER : May I request you that whatever was done yesterday and has come on the record, unless it was declared unparliamentary, it should remain. I would also tell the Minister that if he objected to the word 'policeman', the proper stage was yesterday from your Party.....

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

SHRI P.K. Deo : It is an after-thought.

MR. SPEAKER : I myself do not like that there is an after-thought in you and then you come today and say I want to let this remain on record that the party who elected me were so silent over it. Then, I must be a policeman, after all.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : You are quite right, not a single Member from that side raised any objection.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : He was wrongly quoted Sir. I was sitting here and listening.

MR. SPEAKER : I have been Speaker for three consecutive terms of the Punjab Assembly. I have been the Speaker in the worst period of this Lok Sabha in the last Parliament. But if I have acquired a new title, I welcome it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : When you retire, you will miss all of us.

MR. SPEAKER : If that is what you think about me. I will have to think about myself, whether I should continue as Speaker of this House or not.

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : You should continue. You are not at their mercy. You are unanimously elected Speaker by us all.

MR. SPEAKER : It is for this party also to tell me if they really, tacitly agree to it, then, I have no place to remain here as Speaker in this House.

SHRI H.N. MUKERJEE : What happens is things are said at the heat of the moment which are possibly regretted later, and that sort of thing. The Leader of the House acts *in absentia*; the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is also a cypher and the big party never puts up one representative to say anything worthwhile in regard to the conduct of business in this House with dignity and grace and you are not assisted by the majority party, by the Leader of the House and particularly the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI S. MOHAN KUMAR-MANGALAM) : I think it is not very charitable on the part of the hon Members on the opposite side to take advantage of certain unfortunate remarks which fell yesterday. Repeatedly I did try to get up and say something in order to clear the position. Hon members may examine the record. Mr. Speaker, Sir, certainly we on this side felt resentful, but then, there was a certain tone in the House at that moment, certain bitterness, that was going on, and we did not want to intensify the bitterness and to intensify the conflict. We thought, and I personally thought, that it was a 'storm in a tea cup'. It was a small matter which unfortunately led to what happened yesterday and at the end of the matter, I tried to explain it to show how not a matter of any magnitude.

I would only request that hon Members need not feel too partisan in matters like this. It would be much better if we look upon the Speaker as the possession, and the proud possession, of the House as whole. Once the Speaker has been elevated to the Chair, he occupies a unique position. I think we all look upon him as 'Our Speaker', not the Speaker of this party or that party. Therefore, the defence of the Speaker is the duty of all of us.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
That sermon is not needed.

MR. SPEAKER : I am only happy that we are not following the British practice of hanging the Speaker which they did. They hanged nine Speakers. Well, I should be very lucky if you do not hang me. Two of them were hanged on one day, on the same day. We are in happy times when we confine ourselves to words and not resorting to hanging.

DR. KAILAS (Bombay South) :
Sir, I stood several times to object to such behaviour but I was not heard.

SHRI B.S. MURTHY (Amalapuram) :
I am afraid Shri H.N. Mukerjee has said something which was not relevant . . .

MR. SPEAKER : The Deputy Leader of the Congress Party is too late now.

SHRI P.K. DEO : Why was the Deputy Leader of the Congress Party sleeping yesterday?

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) :
We did not want to participate the matter.

अव्यक्त महोदय : जहाँ सब की पगड़ी उतरती हो, घर-घर स्पीकर की पगड़ी उतारी जाती है ना क्या बात है ?

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : I would make one humble request to you that before we offer an explanation as to why and to what extent we did not join the chorus or noise created in the House, we shall explain it to you in your Chamber, but before that could be done, when the Members of the Opposition speak so loudly and also pass irrelevant and undignified remarks (Interruptions)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : I strongly protest against this.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur) They had passed the remarks and now they are giving a lecture to us.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE :
He is casting aspersions on the entire Opposition.

SHRI R.D. BHANDARE : At that juncture, we do not want to join or we do not want to say anything which will create more confusion. Therefore, we keep quiet. You allow the Members opposite to speak, and whenever we would like to get up, you in fact, always tell us to sit down. Therefore, we shall be coming to your Chamber and explaining our position. . . .

MR. SPEAKER : May I request that this chapter should be closed now? I may honestly tell you that it just came as a matter of surprise to me when Shri N.K.P. Salve raised this point. I had no knowledge about it when he raised that point of order . .

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR : On that, may I just say one word?

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD : We must explain our position also.

MR. SPEAKER : I am going to close this matter. But there is one thing that I must tell you that honestly I never felt that I should snub somebody or that I should tell somebody that he could not speak. But there is one thing which I do not like also, namely Shri Samar Guha's waving his hands to and fro while speaking, a number of times; and hon. Members know may difficulty also, and sometimes they sympathise with me in my Chamber. But here, due to their own exigencies—I do not mind it—they may be doing it. But I am very confident that all hon. Members are good people, except during the zero hour, and I hope that even in the zero hour, we can say bitter things but in a better way. I appeal to hon. Members that we can and we should tolerate bitter things. . . .

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE Kindly make these observations when he is here; otherwise, he will again raise it

MR. SPEAKER He was actually moving his hands to and fro like this, and honestly, without any aspersion, I was myself thinking and I was asking him not to do so and was asking him to explain his question more clearly. But before I could do it, Shri S. Mohan Kumaramangalam got up. We have sometimes to tolerate humour, wit, sarcasm and all that. But since yesterday, I have felt that I shall think ten times before acting in the same manner. Our temper runs unnecessarily high sometimes. Bitter things can be said, and bitter things can be replied to in a better and calmer way. This is Parliament where we are sitting, and if we lose our tempers, what about the younger generation? So, all of us, including myself, should try to cool down.

If anyone feels angry, I would request him to just leave for an hour, there are number of glasses of water kept there in the lobby and let him just have a sip and then come here.

For me, if you allow me, I will keep a glass of water here because I cannot go out.

We now pass on to the next time.

DR. KAILAS I was standing on behalf of my party. But I could not get a chance to speak.

13.00 hrs.

RE RULE 377

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) . On 31 July 1972 I had given a notice under rule 377. I was told to wait for two days; I have waited for four days. It is a very brief matter.

MR. SPEAKER : I am sorry. In regard to rule 377, we committed a mistake. In the beginning, this rule was meant to accommodate matters not falling within questions, short notice questions, adjournment motions, calling attention motions or any other substantive motion. There is a thin line between a point of order and other matters. Therefore, the Speaker was authorised to accommodate it under this rule.

Now Shri Banerjee in his very persuasive manner sometimes persuades me saying 'This is a simple thing. I just want to say to say a word'.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA (Serampore) You have a weakness for him.

MR. SPEAKER Yes. By and by like calling attention motions, this has developed. I have read the history of calling attention motions. I was associated with it. It was allowed because sometimes adjournment motion was not allowed. The member was permitted to ask one question for clarification. Then the clarification got prolonged, became a speech. Also the question became elongated into (a), (b), (c) and so on. This is what the calling attention motion has become now.

As I said, this poor 377 was just a thin line between a point of order and other motions. I am not going to disclose the names, but quite a number of members have come to me representing that is not meant for that. It should be used by a member once a week. If the matter is very urgent, he can write. There is a lot of other procedures available. The member can table a motion, a short notice question, other question, he can make use of the calling attention procedure, he can send it in any other form. Or the no-day-yet named motion procedure may be availed of. But let not this poor innocent 377 be exploited.