copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962:—

(i) G.S.R. 535, dated the 30th March, 1965.

(ii) G.S.R. 536, dated the 30th March, 1965.

[*Placed in Library, Sea* No. LT-4194/65].

12.12½ hrs.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

SEVENTY-FIFTH AND SEVENTY-NINTH REPORTS

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): I beg to present the following Reports of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture):—

(1) Seventy-fifth Report on the Indian Council of Agricultural Research; and

(2) Seventy-ninth Report on the Central Potato Research Institute, Simla.

12.13 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister of Planning (Shri B. R. Bhagat): On behalf of Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, with your permission, Sir, I rise to announce that Government Business in this House for the week commencing 19th April, 1965, will consist of:—

(1) Consideration of any item of Government Business carried over from today's Order Paper.

(2) Discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants relating to the following Ministries:

Industry and Supply
Education
Home Affairs
Food and Agriculture.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Some assurance was given by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs about the consideration or the discussion on the opinion expressed by the Supreme Court regarding the conflict between the high court and the legislature in Uttar Pradesh. It was said that after the demands for grants are over, there will be a discussion on that subject.

Mr. Speaker: There are some weeks to go still. He can mention it at that time.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You know, Sir, that at the fag-end of the session, nothing is discussed.

Mr. Speaker: In between, we cannot have any such thing.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Can we have some assurance that it will be discussed in this session?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Daji.

Shri Daji (Indore): I would like to ask the Government, through you, especially because the Prime Minister is present here, one question. An assurance was given to us that the Bonus Bill would be brought here and passed in this session of Parliament. But yesterday the Labour Minister, actually speaking, put the jitters to it, and he said that the Bill is ready and it will be introduced, but it will come up only if time permits. In view of the united demand of the workers of the INTUC, AITUC, HMS and HMP that the Bonus Bill must be brought before the House and passed in this session, will the Government see—because unless the Government moves in the matter from

now on, it would not be ready even by the month of May—that sufficient time is kept and the Bonus Bill is introduced and discussed during this very session?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): By your leave, Sir, I seek clarification on three points. The first is, the Home Ministry's demands will come up for discussion next week, Wednesday or Thursday, and you were good enough to advise or rather direct the Ministers to see to it that the reports of their Ministries are laid on the Table and made available to Members well in advance of the debate on the Ministry's demands. As far as I am aware, the Home Ministry's report has not reached us, except a small, thin, very meagre brochure on administrative reforms. You may kindly direct that the report, should be supplied tomorrow.

Secondly, I had asked the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs more than two weeks ago to let the House know what the duration of the session would be. Nothing authoritative has come so far.

Mr. Speaker: I have received intimation that the government intends that the session should continue up to the 11th May.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If that is so, I submit that speculation is rife and all sorts of rumours are floating about as to why the 11th has been fixed. One of the reports is that the Prime Minister is leaving for the Soviet Union. While we wish him godspeed and a successful mission to the United States and the Soviet Union, I want the House should sedulously avoid creating an impression that the business of the House is being adapted or adjusted to the needs of the executive, and of the Prime Minister. I remember when the late Prime Minister used to be away from India, the Parliamentary session continued. Moreover, we shall find a lot of Bills being pushed out to the next session. We will have now only 2 days after the Finance Bill is passed. What can we do in two days?

Mr. Speaker: That would be seen. What is his third point?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I have been raising the point of quorum. In the absence of any authentic statement from the Government benches, the press is coming out with its own conjectures. The latest disconcerting report is that the government is thinking in terms of reducing the quorum to 25 or something like that. While I realise that the government can, with its brute majority, reduce the quorum even to 5 and make it literally a panchayat so to say, I would like to warn government that if they resort to this egregiously, blatantly, reactionary , move....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: There is nothing unparliamentary in what I have said.

Mr. Speaker: I do not say it is unparliamentary. But it should be relevant to the point we are discussing. He can ask whether such a Bill is being brought. That is all. What have the other things to do with that? At this moment only the business—what is being brought and what is not being brought—may be questioned. This is not an opportunity where the government should be criticised for other things also.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I was only trying to impress on you, as the supreme custodian of the rights and privileges of this House, that this matter was brought before the government two or three weeks ago and no authoritative statement is coming forth from government. Therefore, all sorts of unhealthy rumours, are floating about. I want to Scotch those rumours, if I can. Therefore, if they do not say something definite about it and if they undertake this move of

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

reducing the quorum to 25 even 5, they will be driving the first nail into the coffin of parliamentary democracy in this country. That is the warning I give to the Government.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): From the reply to Mr. Kamath's question, we are able to say that the House would be in session for only 2 days after the Finance Bill is passed. But government say that they have so many Bills to be considered by this House. I wish to warn the government that they would be running a very grave risk indeed if they do not prepare and introduce the Bill in regard to the language and give an indication of their intentions to the country as well as to this House to get the Bill passed before the session is over.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : यह रेलिवेंट कैसे हो सकता है ? पिछली बार इन्हीं माननीय सदस्य ने इसी बात पर ग्रापत्ति की थी ग्रौर ग्राप ने उस से ग्रपनी सहमति प्रकट की थी ।

ग्रध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त यह सवाल किया जा सकता है कि ग्राया यह बिल लाया जा रहा है या नहीं ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री : पर माननीय सदस्य ने तो यह पूछा है कि क्या सरकार इस सम्बन्ध में निर्णय ले चुकी है यह रेलिवेंट नहीं है । ग्रापने पीछे जब मैं ने इसी प्रकार का प्रश्न उठाया था तो कहा था कि मैं भी इसे ठीक समझता हूं ग्रौर केवल इतना पूछा जा सकता है कि ग्रगले सप्ताह में यह बिल पेश हो सकता है या नहीं ।

ग्रध्यक्ष महोदय : ग्रब भी मैं यही कह रहा हूं कि इस वक्त यही सवाल पूछे जा सकते हैं, दूसरे नहीं ।

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): I would like to submit to the Government, Sir, through you, that the Business of the House may be announced at least a fortnight ahead so that some hon. Members who want to participate in any important business and who, at the same time, may be called upon to go back to their constituencies, may arrange their programme in time so that they may be able to participate in the discussions here and also serve their constituencies. Booking is very difficult these days. Even if we want to cancel the booking, we are not able to do it in time. We find it very difficult, and therefore I would request the Government to announce the business a fortnight ahead.

Secondly, there is the question of imposition of President's Rule in Kerala. It has been in existence for more than a fortnight. That question has not been discussed in the House. It is a very important matter and it cannot be slurred over.

Mr. Speaker: We are in the midst of financial business. Until this is finished it will not be possible for us to take that up.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: But the other thing is very important.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फ़र्रुखाबाद) : क्या सरकार संविधान की धारा 113 पर फ़ौरन बहस करवा रही है ? यह धारा बिल्कुल साफ़ कहती है कि सदन में हर एक मांग पर---भारत निधि की मांगों तक पर भी---बहस हो सकती है । तो ग्रब बहस का सवाल यह उठता है कि क्या इस धारा को पंद्रह, सत्रह बरस की प्रणाली ख़त्म कर सकती है, या जो कोई भी पार्टियों के नेता है, वे ग्रापस में बैठ कर इस को खत्म कर सकते हैं । मेरा कहना यह है कि जब तक सब के सब 510 सदस्य इस धारा को ख़त्म करने की बात नहीं मान लेते, तब तक यह धारा रहती है ग्रौर मैं वह 510 वां सदस्य हूं, जो इस धारा 113 के मुताबिक इस सदन में विशेष कर के लोक सभा की मांग पर बहस चाहता हूं ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस बारे में जो सवाल उठाया गया था, मैं ने उस का जो जवाब देना था, वह मैंने दे दिया है। अगर बार-बार, हर रोज, यह सवाल उठता रहे, माननीय सदस्य वही बात कहते रहें और मैं भी अपना जवाब दोहराता रहूं, तो इस से क्या फ़ायदा है और इस से हम कहां तक पहुंचेंगे ? मेरे लिए मश्किल यह है कि इस से शायद कंट्री में कोई ऐसा ख़याल बैठे कि स्पीकर कोई चीज़ ऐसी कर रहा है, जिस को वह छिपाना चाहता है और उस को छिपाने के लिए वह यह सब कुछ कर रहा है। जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, मैंने इस बारे में जो कुछ कहना था, वह कह दिया है। अगर हाउस चाहता है, तो वह बड़ी खुशी से फ़ैसला करे और इस को डिस्कस कर ले। मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है।

मेरे डिपार्टमेंट की ऐसी कौन सी चीज़ हो सकती है, जो मैं छिपाना चाहता हूं या जो मैं छिपा कर करता हूं ? मैंने कहा था कि इस में मुझे खतरा यह है कि जब कोई मैम्बर साहबान खड़े हो कर लोक सभा को डिस्कस करेंगे और वह लोक सभा सेक्रेटेरियट की एपायंटमेंटस, प्रोमोशन्ज और दूसरी बातें लायेंगे तो जो यहां के मुलाजिम, एम्पलाईज हैं, वे उन मेम्बर्ज के पास जायेंगे कि हमारा केस रिप्रेजेन्ट करो। तो उस से न यहां एफ़िशेंसी रहेगी, न मैं काम कर सकूंगा और हाउस को जो सर्विस मिलती है, वह भी नहीं मिल सकेगी। बजाए इस के कि जो इन्तजाम आज तक चलता आया है, उस की तारीफ़ करें, माननीय सदस्य उस को बदलना चाहते हैं। आज तक जो इन्तज़ाम चलता आया है, वह सिर्फ़ सत्रह साल की बात नहीं है, बल्कि इस को तीस साल हो गये हैं। जब से यह हाउस बना है, सेंट्रल एसेम्बली के वक्त से आज तक यह कभी नहीं किया गया है और जैसा कि मैंने कहा है, दूसरी जगह भी ऐसा नहीं किया गया है।

मैंने इस के लिए एक कमेटी मकर्रर कर दी। एक मतालिबा यह आया कि इस कमेटी में एक अपोजीशन का मेम्बर भी शामिल किया जाये। मैंने यह भी कहा कि मैं इस को कनसिडर करने और उस को शामिल करने के लिए तैयार हूं। अगर इस के बावजूद रोज यह सवाल उठता रहा, तो यही बात होगी कि जिन आदमियों ने इन्तजाम करना है और हाउस की सर्विस करनी है, वे ऐसा नहीं कर सकेंगे। यह सर्विस एक अलाहिदा सर्विस है— यह दूसरी मिनिस्ट्रीज की तरह से सर्विस नहीं है। मेम्बर साहबान यहां पर प्राम्ट, उसी वक्त कार्यवाही चाहते हैं, जब कि उस का नोटिस मिले। अगर उस में एक मिनट भी देर होती है और वह काम नहीं होता है और उन को इत्तिला नहीं पहुंचती है, तो उस पर भी यहां एतराज होता है। अगर इस पर भी यह हाउस मुनासिब समझे, तो वह लोक सभा को डिस्कस कर सकता है। मेरे पास क्या है, जो मैं छिपाना चाहता हूं और जिस के लिए बार-बार कहना चाहता हूं कि इसको डिस्कस न किया जाये, इस को रहने दिया जाये।

यहां के एकाऊंटस को आडिटर-जेनेरल आडिट करता है। जो साहब चाहें, वे उस की रिपोर्ट को देखें। इस के एस्टीमेंटस को देखने के लिए मैं ने एक कमेटी मुकर्रर कर दी है। मैंने यह भी वायदा किया है कि माननीय सदस्य और भी जो कुछ देखना चाहें, देख सकते हैं और इन्फ़र्मेशन हासिल कर सकते हैं। अगर इस के बावजूद माननीय सदस्य इस को डिस्कस करना चाहें, तो बेशक करें। मेरे पास छिपाने के लिए कोई चीज नहीं है। यह मैं नहीं कर सकता कि मेरे लिए कोई और मिनिस्टर साहब जवाब दें और

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

मुझे उन को सैटिसफ़ाई करना पड़े । फिर यही होगा कि मैं यहां पर कुर्सी पर बैठ कर उन बातों का जवाब दूं, जो कि यहां उठाई जाएं ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप ने कुछ बातें मेरे सम्बन्ध में कही हैं, इस लिए आप मुझे थोड़ी सी सफ़ाई देने दीजिये ।

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: It is quite true that last time when he raised this point your main objection was that if we have discussion of this Secretariat in this House, we will become subservient to a Minister, Ministry or the Government. That is a very important and weighty argument. But the argument which you have now put forward that it will lead to the habit of various employees coming and approaching Members....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह तो इन एडीशन है ।

Perhaps the hon. lady Member was not present at that time. Day before yesterday I had advanced that argument also.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: That particular point or argument has great weight in it. But the argument which you have just mentioned, that they are going to approach Members and, therefore, their efficiency will be reduced, that argument I think does no honour either to us or to the employees. I would also suggest to you that there should be some sort of negotiating machinery whereby the various difficulties which are voiced by employees can be brought forward and redressed. That is a point which, I think, has great validity and I think all sections of the House will support that proposal.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरी जाती सफ़ाई सुन लीजिए ।

श्री क० ना० तिवारी (बगाहा) : पायंट ग्राफ़ ग्रार्डर ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आप को बाद में बुलाता हूं । पहले मैं डा० लोहिया को सुन लूं :

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं आप को किस तरह बताऊं कि जो पैसा आप का महकमा खर्च कर रहा है, वह पैसा सार्वजनिक ढंग से खर्च कर रहा है या निजी ढंग से खर्च कर रहा है, इस बहस से मुझ को कोई मतलब नहीं है । मैं तो कोई व्यापक बहस उठाना चाहता हूं कि लोक सभा का काम किस तरह से चले । मान लीजिए कि आप पर अविश्वास प्रस्ताव आ जाये, तो आखिर उस पर बहस होगी या नहीं ? आखिर वह बहस तो होती है न ? इसके अलावा....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उस का तो प्राविजन खास तौर पर किया गया है । माननीय सदस्य जो बात कह रहे हैं, वही तो रुकावट है इस बहस में, जो कि वह करना चाहते हैं, क्योंकि स्पीकर पर नुक्ताचीनी तभी हो सकती है, जब हाउस में उस के खिलाफ़ सीधा अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव आ जाये । इस के बगैर उस पर नुक्ताचीनी नहीं हो सकती है । अगर लोक सभा पर बहस की जायेगी, तो फिर माननीय सदस्य इनडायरेक्टली उस पर नुक्ताचीनी करेंगे । अगर माननीय सदस्य सीधे अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव ले आयें, तो जाहिर है कि न उस पर मुझे आपत्ति है और न कोई रुकावट डाल सकता है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं आप का ध्यान धारा 113 की तरफ़ खींचना चाहता हूं । आप मेहरबानी कर के उस को पढ़ तो लीजिए । उस में यहां तक लिखा हुआ है कि भारत निधि की मांगों पर भी बहस हो सकती है और राष्ट्रपति की मांग पर भी बहस हो सकती है—आप अपनी बात तो छोड़ ही दीजिए । यह साफ़ धारा 113 में लिखा

हुआ है। तो आप किस तरह इस बहस को रोक सकते हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने जो कहना था वह कह दिया है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: तो फिर आप मेरी लाचारी सुन लीजिए। मैं दूसरी मर्तबा आप को बताए देता हूं। सिवाये अदालत में जाने के मेरे सामने घोई रास्ता नहीं है। (*Interruption*).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

डाक्टर साहब ने उस दिन कहा कि यह पहला नोटिस है अदालत में जाने का और आज उन्होंने कहा कि यह दूसरा नोटिस है अदालत में जाने का। जहां तक अदालत का सम्बन्ध है, उस के अपने काम हैं, उस का प्राविन्स है, उस को हर एक हक़ है। जो वह मुनासिब समझें, वह कर सकते हैं और वह करें। उस को बराबर जूरिसडिक्शन है और वह उस को देखते हैं। अदालत में जाना तो कोई गुनाह नहीं है। मगर बार-बार अदालत का नाम ले कर मुझे डराना.... (*Interruptions*)

श्री शिंकरे (मरमागोआ) : डराना नहीं है।

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। जब एक दिन किसी बात पर स्पीकर का डिसिशन हो जाए तो क्या उस सवाल को बार बार उठाया जा सकता है और क्या उसकी इजाजत स्पीकर देगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बिल्कुल नहीं उठाया जा सकता है। मेरी एक मुश्किल है। बार बार उठाने से अगर रोका जाए तो कहीं ऐसा बाहर न निकल जाए कि स्पीकर उस चीज को छिपाना चाहता है शायद इसलिए वह इसको उठाने की इजाजत नहीं देता है। मैं तो तकलीफ बता रहा हूं।

श्री समनानी (जम्मू तथा काश्मीर) : तीसरा नोटिस भी पेशगी ले लीजिये।

[شری سمنانی -- تیسرا نوٹس بھی پیشگی لے لیجئے -]

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने तो कह लिया है। इसका जवाब तो मैं दे चुका हूं।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : कहां दे चुके हैं ?

This is a new point raised.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसका जवाब तो पहले कितनी ही बार दिया जा चुका है।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I wanted to make a submission in this connection. In pursuance of the assurance you gave us last year when I raised the point in March last year, you were good enough to appoint a committee and you told the House some time ago that it has scrutinised the Demands and estimates of the House. Now I would only request you that any Member, who wants to have access to the committee's report, may be allowed to have that.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, yes; certainly.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Secondly, last year I had raised the point that the estimates or Demands on account of the Rajya Sabha also should be scrutinised by this committee. I do not know why the committee cannot have the authority to go into the Demands of the other House. Demands of both the Houses should be scrutinised.

Mr. Speaker: Both Houses are sovereign.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Both Houses are not sovereign. That House does not have a committee.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot interfere. Any Member from that House might raise it there. Let them consider it; we should not do it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The constitutional provision is there that the Lok Sabha is authorised and has got the power to go into ministries' Demands—all Demands. The Rajya Sabha can go into only the Finance Bill and the Appropriation Bill. No Demands go to the Rajya Sabha.

Mr. Speaker: For harmonious working we ought not to make such suggestions.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How does it lead to lack of harmony, I do not understand.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): The hon. Member has drawn the attention of the House to article 113 of the Constitution. It is true that article 113 is a very essential article of our Constitution.

An Hon. Member: That is over.

Shri D. C. Sharma: But, after watching the proceedings of this Lok Sabha for the last 13 years, I have found that it is not every Ministry whose Demands come up for discussion here. That article has to work within the framework of the availability of time and also within the context of the needs of the House. This is what has been happening all these years. I have not found anything in the argument put forward by the hon. Member which shows that the precedents which we have set up for the last 13 years so far as the Demands of Lok Sabha go should in any way be over-ridden. I think, on the other hand, during the last 17 years the Lok Sabha has come to acquire a good name not only in this country but abroad also, for efficient working, for integrity and for administrative balance. I will not be divulging any secret if I say that there are representatives of other democracies who come to see our functioning and who go home with new ideas so that they can be employed so far as the functioning of those democracies is concerned. This Parliament has been under cross-examination not only by some Indian political scientists but also by foreign or international political scientists.

Shri Koya (Kozhikode): The latest is Kerala.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I think that all those persons have said that the functioning of this Parliament is in some ways so satisfactory that they could take some lessons from this.

My second point is that you have already appointed a committee.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): Let us not discuss it now.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Member would kindly be very brief now.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I do not know why Congress Members do not want me to speak.

Mr. Speaker: He would kindly conclude now.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I was submitting very respectfully that you have already appointed a Committee. That Committee can go into the questions and the audited accounts of the Lok Sabha are open to the scrutiny of anybody. In the light of this, I feel that it will not be necessary to put these demands to the vote of the House.

Mr. Speaker: That should be sufficient; there should not be such a long speech.

Shri D. C. Sharma: Sir, so far as the threat of law court is concerned, as you have said, nobody can prevent anybody from going to any law court. I think people who give threats are not justified in their threats. But, I think, the floor of this House should not be made use of for uttering such threats. That takes away the dignity and the decorum of the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Sir, Mr. Kamath has raised a point which seems to be rather important. Every penny spent out from

the Consolidated Fund of our country has got to be sanctioned by this House alone. Whether we do it after discussion is a matter which we decide. In regard to Parliament Secretariat, we did have certain conventions. You have decided in your wisdom to bring about a certain change which is, to a certain extent, certainly for the better—no doubt about it. But what perplexes me is that you are appointing a committee which would examine matters pertaining only to the Lok Sabha while the Rajya Sabha being sovereign in its own sphere is kept out of the picture. If it is a principled approach to the matter, whatever is spent on account of Rajya Sabha is also sanctioned by Lok Sabha and not by Rajya Sabha. That being so, if you have a committee at all to daal with Parliament Secretariat, it deals not with Lok Sabha Secretariat alone to the exclusion of Rajya Sabha Secretariat because that would be an invidious process which is neither here nor there. For substantial reasons, we might have discussions with regard to the employment conditions in your office and that sort of thing. But that is a different matter altogether. Once, as a matter of principle, you appoint a committee for Lok Sabha to scrutinise the accounts of Lok Sabha Secretariat and keep out the Rajya Sabha expenses, because that is sacrosanct, is something which goes against the grain of the Constitution. Lok Sabha is entrusted with certain duties. We might perform it in one way or the other. But if you have a committee for the Lok Sabha Secretariat, surely it has the right, and it ought to have the right, to examine the funds of the Rajya Sabha.

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Should we not conclude now?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You may give a ruling on that.

Mr. Speaker: There seems to be some substance in that. I will consider.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You may give it on Monday.

Mr. Speaker: I will consider that. There is some substance in that.

श्री रामसेवक यादव (बारांबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूं——

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब और नहीं।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : एक मिनट में मैं खत्म कर दूंगा। बहुत देर से मैं खड़ा हो रहा हूं और आपकी नजर पकड़ने की कोशिश कर रहा हूं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : और भी तो खड़े हो रहे हैं....

श्री रामसेवक यादव : इतनी देर में तो मैं खत्म भी कर देता।

माननीय सदस्य डा० लोहिया ने जो प्रश्न उठाया है उस सिलसिले में आपने दिक्कत बताई है। मैं उस चीज में न जा कर केवल यही निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि दिक्कत हो सकती है, अड़चन हो सकती है लेकिन संविधान में जो एक निश्चित व्यवस्था है तो उस व्यवस्था को क्या इस सदन की परम्परायें समाप्त कर सकती हैं? वे समाप्त नहीं कर सकती हैं। जो अधिकार संविधान के द्वारा एक सदस्य को मिला हुआ है उस अधिकार के उपभोग को क्या परम्परा कोई रोक सकती है?

दूसरी बात यह है कि संविधान की धारा अगर रास्ते में बाधक है और जो दिक्कत आपने बताई है, अगर वह है तो क्या फिर उसका संशोधन होना चाहिये या नहीं होना चाहिये। उसके रहते आप कैसे रोक लगा सकते हैं? इस पर मैं आपका निर्णय चाहता हूं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : निर्णय यही है कि हाउस ने फैसला करना है कि किस डिमांड पर बहस होनी चाहिये, किस पर हम सोचेंगे किस पर विचार करेंगे।

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : क्या हाउस कानून के बरखिलाफ़ जा सकता है?

अध्यक्ष महोदय: यह हाउस की मर्जी है, बरखिलाफ जाना नहीं है। अगर यह हाउस का फैसला हो कि हम किसी चीज पर विचार नहीं करेंगे तो हाउस खुद मालिक है (इंटरप्शंज) मुझे तो खत्म कर लेने दें। इस तरह से आप बोलें तो न चले जायें।

499 आदमी नहीं चाहते हैं और एक आदमी चाहता है तो एक आदमी को हक नहीं है कि उसके कहने पर उस पर बहस जरूर की जाए।

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : क्या कट मोशन दिये जा सकते हैं। अगर एक आदमी कट मोशन देना चाहे तो दे सकता है या नहीं। बहस की बात अलग है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने कह दिया। मुझे और कुछ नहीं कहना है। जो चीज डिस्कस नहीं हो रही है उस के ऊपर कट मोशनन्स कैसे डिस्कस होंगे।

श्री किशन पटनायक : वोट के लिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरे पास मनिस्टर आफ पार्लियामेंटरी अफेअर्स का टेलिफोन आया था कि वह बीमार हैं और यहां जो सवाल उठाये गये हैं उन का जवाब वह सोमवार को देंगे।

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : और आप भी अपना अपना निर्णय देंगे।

12.40 hrs.

DEMAND FOR GRANTS—*contd.*

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT—*contd.*

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Transport.

Shri S. C. Samanta may now continue his speech.

Shri S. C. Samanta (Tamluk): Yesterday, I was referring to the border roads of Rajasthan, when my hon. friend Shri Surendranath Dwivedy interrupted and asked me 'What about the Pakistan side? They have built roads'. It is for this purpose that I am placing this matter before the House and bringing up the question of border roads in Rajasthan. These border roads in Rajasthan will cover five districts there namely Barmer, Jaisalmer, Jodhpur, Binkaner and Ganganagar. There should be one road connecting all the outposts. I would request the hon. Minister to see that the proposal to build roads from Barmer to Bhaksar, and Barmer to Gadra, and from Bhaskar to Manobar is taken up earnestly and executed. The Border Road Development Organisation is doing good work, on the eastern side also. So, if they are asked to do this work, they will do the needful.

Now, I would like to say something about national highways. I would refer in particular to national highway No. 6 which is being rebuilt to connect Calcutta directly with Bombay. There were some disconnections there, and bridges are being built on that highway. I would refer to the construction of a bridge on the Rupnarain river at Kolaghat. The House will be astonished to know that at that spot the railway line goes on the bridge. The Transport Ministry decided that a road bridge should be built. Even at that time I had protested against this and said that there should be a road-*cum*-rail bridge there, because the railway line also was there. But you will be astonished to hear that year