

कल मैंने इन के बारे में कहा था। बार-बार कहा गया और श्री राधेलाल व्यास ने भी कहा था कि एमीनेंट लायर्स हैं, उनसे राय ली जा सकती है।

I will get it examined. I have heard all the parties now on what I should do.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): You have not heard me.

Mr. Speaker: I will decide in a day or two and then let the House know.

श्री मधु लिमये : 388 के मातहत में प्रस्ताव करना चाहता हूँ . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रस्ताव इस तरह से नहीं रख सकते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं प्रस्ताव रख रहा हूँ। कि नियम को स्थगित किया जाए इस वक्तव्य को ले कर। पहले भी आपने कई बार इसकी इजाजत दी है। सदन के नेता को आपने कई बार इजाजत दी है (इंटरपूज) अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपका क्या कहना है इसके बारे में ?

12.53 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FIFTIETH REPORT

The Minister of State in the department of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Jaganatha Rao): Sir, I beg move:

"That this House agrees with the Fiftieth report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 2nd November, 1966."

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I will place it before the House. Motion moved:

"That this House agrees with the Fiftieth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to

the House on the 2nd November, 1966."

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): I beg to move:

"That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely:—

'subject to the modification that paragraph 3 of the said Report be omitted'."

Mr. Speaker: He should be brief.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I will be as brief as I can. Para 3 of this report is wholly ultra vires of the Rules of Procedure. But before I come to the main argument, may I invite your attention to the fact that this report is signed by you—"Hukam Singh, Chairman, Business Advisory Committee". There is a strange phrase in para 3, some incomprehensible phrase towards the end of that para which "recommends subject to the approval of the Speaker." I hope there is no inherent, insuperable dichotomy between you as the Speaker and you, Sir, as the Chairman of the Business Advisory Committee. But for the fact that this document bears the weighty imprimatur of an august personage such as yourself, I would have had no hesitation in saying that para 3 is riddled with inconsistencies and contradictions which will land the House in ludicrous, preposterous situations. But because this para bears your signature I do not want to say that; otherwise I would have said...

Mr. Speaker: After having said all that.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): He has not said that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I come to the rule which should be read with para 3? There is a curious spent more than half an hour last "miscellaneous items of business." I spent more than half an hour last night and again this morning in a vain search for what this 'miscellaneous

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

ous' business is. The Rules of Procedure—this is the latest edition—has an index and I waded through the index, a very elaborate index, and I waded through all the rules. There is no word 'miscellaneous' which has been used in connection with the business of the House. I invite your attention to the index heading 'Business'. There is the arrangement of Government business; there is the "financial business"; there is the "List of Business" and then there is "Private Members' Business". These are the various categories of business of the House. Now the Committee suggests—I do not question their wisdom; of course they are all wise, honourable men—that all the miscellaneous items should be disposed of by the House before half-past 12, that is, 12.30. Now, on those days where such a report comes before the House, what does the proviso to Rule 290 say? It confers the right on Members of the House to discuss this report up to thirty minutes, for half-an-hour, so that if there is one item like this under the Rules, you cannot prevent Members from discussing that for thirty minutes, and each Member can take five minutes.

Now, take rules 25 and 31—arrangement of business. "On days allotted for the transaction of Government business, such business shall have precedence and the Secretary shall arrange that business in such order as the Speaker may, after consultation with the Leader of the House determine...." That means that whenever a list comes before the House, that is, the list of business, all these things have taken place. Out of these discussions, confabulations and deliberations, serious discussion with the Leader of the House, all that has been done. Then the List of business comes before us. That means to say, all business in the List of business, except the Private Members' Business, would be Government business. That is according to rule 25.

Rule 31 concerns the List of Business; it says that, a list of business for the day shall be prepared by the Secretary and a copy thereof shall be made available for the use of every Member. Now, the recommendations made by the Committee comes into conflict with every rule that I have cited—Rules 25, 31 and also 290. I do not know whether it was passed in haste or the Committee was hustled into it. But I do not wish to go into that matter. I am told reliably that some Members did not agree to this para being included in the report. The representative of my party opposed the inclusion of that para. I will put it before you. This seeks to curtail the rights and privileges of the House; it is almost tantamount to breach of privilege of the House. What will happen? Suppose you are standing and giving an important ruling at 12.25 or 12.27, at 12.30 the ruling would come to a dead stop and you would resume your ruling at 6 O'clock? It is like asking you to have a good dinner and wanting you to finish it in 10 or 15 minutes or else to resume it afterwards; it is something similar to that. It is similar to that. Now, is the Government hoping, by any stretch of the imagination, that the House will be so minded as to accept this absurd position? Now, at 6 O'clock, if some business is resumed,—Government business—it is the Government's duty, business, to guarantee and ensure quorum in the House. Suppose, there is no quorum at 6 O'clock when the business is taken up, and some Member with his rights raises the point of quorum, the business will lapse, and is taken up the next day. Again, it will be taken up after the Question Hour.

13 hrs.

Therefore, it is a serious matter for the consideration of the House; and it beats me, it is incomprehensible to me why you should have sign-

ed this report including this para, as Chairman of the Business Advisory Committee. I would only urge, request and would appeal to the Members to consider this matter very seriously, earnestly, that it is a serious inroad into the rights and liberties of Members of the House.

Mr. Speaker: He should finish now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Please do not be so impatient. It is an important matter. (*Interruption*) You are curtailing here—better be patient. I have not spoken at all today. I never put any question this morning because I was preparing for this matter, and I look upon this as a very serious matter. The Committee should not have recommended this matter at all, because I urge that Parliament becomes ineffective in voicing the mirror of national opinion, as an instrument of people's will, by these changes that are sought to be made. You are aware that in the House of Commons, in Great Britain, there is a move for procedural reform, and in that matter, members of the ruling party have demanded that the party should not be subject to any whip of the party in deciding about procedural matters.

Mr. Speaker: It should not take more than five minutes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If Parliament becomes ineffective, there will be only one alternative before the country, outside; there will be a bloody revolution, God forbid.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): I wanted to say only this much. Unfortunately, yesterday, I was on my legs here and could not attend the meeting of the Business Advisory Committee. But I am perturbed to see this; and when I heard from my party Member who attended the meeting. The Business Advisory Committee had again set up a very healthy convention that we do not include anything which has not been decided by the consensus; we never

take a vote in the Business Advisory Committee. But yesterday, points have been included here which did not have the consensus.

Firstly, there is the question of the motion of no-confidence, on which the representative from my party did state that we would like to have more than 12 hours, because, you know that there were Calling Attention Notices, Adjournment Motions, questions about student unrest, the question of drought, question of railway accidents and discussions thereon, and so on. You had ruled that all these could go into the motion of no-confidence. You will agree that important questions which need very deep thinking and discussion are there before the House. So how can we lump them all together in a no-confidence motion in which there are only 12 hours. That is why we object. Our Member asked that it should be recorded. If I had been there I would have said that the ruling party is trying to get out of all the conventions. Here we always try to argue it out logically and we hope that some logic at least is acceptable to the Treasury Benches, and we would have been able to come to some sort of reasonable understanding. Our Member did not agree to it. He asked that it should be recorded, as a note of dissent. I do not know why he agreed to it at all.

Secondly, I am told that item 3 was never discussed in the Business Advisory Committee meeting. It was not discussed.

An hon. Member: It was discussed.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: When all of them had stood up—(*Interruption*)—do not interrupt me; please hear me—when everybody was on his legs, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs suddenly said that only half-an-hour should be taken for the miscellaneous items; whatever they wanted to discuss could be discussed within half-an-

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

hour. (*Interruption*) Nobody discussed that item, and it has been brought in surreptitiously as item three. I say we cannot accept this; for the first time in 15 years, such a thing has occurred. I feel that this should be rejected.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I was surprised that this report has come from the Business Advisory Committee and, as Shri Kamath has said, over your signature. It is extremely distressing that, as Shrimati Renu Chakravartty pointed out, the convention we have established over so many years now, that the decisions of the Business Advisory Committee embody a consensus, is being overthrown because of certain reports we find appearing in the press every day about the consensus and we have to wake up and do something about their positive role in Parliamentary procedure; we know what their positive role is. We can twist so many of them in debate on our little finger and therefore they are trying to do something by the backdoor. I do not understand why this Committee would take such a presumptuous step. I am very sorry to have to say this because this is one of the most important parliamentary committees over which you preside. But how is it that this Committee could recommend something which goes not only against the rights of Parliament but is a reflection on the Chair? I do not understand for the life of me how you could be a signatory to this report.

This Committee has the gumption to recommend that at zero hour this House should not waste more than half an hour of the nation's time. It does reflect upon you, primarily, and on the House; at zero hour, at 12 O'clock, what the Committee chooses to call "Miscellaneous items of business"—a phrase for which Shri Kamath has had to hunt through this book on which he has made such a particular study miscellaneous items of business—which include items which Members

of the House may bring—whether it is right or wrong, it is for you to decide—and which enables Members to have Adjournment Motions, to have Calling Attention Notices, to have so many things laid on the Table of the House for God knows good, bad or indifferent reasons, and so many other matters, statements, and so on, come up. And here is a directive given to us by the majority in the Committee, who had no business to assert their majority strength in that chamber. We are told that we should finish our work in half an hour's time. We are told by implication that the Speaker or whoever else happens to be in the Chair in that particular period from day to day is not aware of his responsibilities and extends the period of discussion by the House beyond the legitimate limit of half an hour. This is an implied reflection on the Chair which you have thought fit—for God knows what—to subscribe to. I think this matter had been dealt with in a fit of absent-mindedness; it is something I hope you will regret and the House will not allow it to get away with.

Here is a suggestion which the House, if it has any self-respect, cannot possibly countenance; and that is why I feel that quite apart from the details of the matter—12 to 15 hours, or whatever it may be—these gentlemen do not care about how the debate is conducted and they know very well that they cannot perform at all and they are trying to bind down the procedure of this House and that is why they have the gumption to suggest that more than half an hour shall not be allowed for discussion of the many important matters which happen to come up, whether the Government like it or not, between 12 O'clock and some later hour. I therefore feel that this is a reflection on the House. It is a reflection pre-eminently on the Chair which you happen to occupy at the present moment. It is a suggestion which is entirely out of keeping

with parliamentary procedure, and the spirit and the functioning of it. Therefore, this should be thrown away with the contempt it deserves and the House should override this particular recommendation.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergode): I understand from the Member who attended the Business Advisory Committee from my group that as far as the time for no-confidence motion is concerned, there was a unanimous opinion that it must not be 12 hours. I do not want to speak more because already it has been expressed here. Even the time for the expression of opinion through the no-confidence motion is curtailed and only a limited time is given. Does that mean there is no use of even placing our point of view in this discussion, because one will not be able to express—it is a very important thing and it is a different matter whether the Government likes it or not—what one wants to say, and what we feel about it; it is only 12 hours.

As far as the third item is concerned, you say that exactly at 12.30, everything must be over. As we have seen, that will create more difficulties, and as Shri Kamath has said, to say that the time-limit of 12.30 should be fixed is wrong. I agree with what he has said. I entirely oppose this report.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): I was present at the Business Advisory Committee meeting yesterday. I am not going to speak upon these items under para 2.

As regards item 3, not only on second thought but even otherwise, I agree with my hon. friend, Shri Mukerjee that probably we did not apply our mind at all to this question as it has now been put before the House by Shri Kamath.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): The point is whether there was any discussion about this in the Committee?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I do not think that we did have any discussion of it except that Shri Satya Narayan Sinha said that we want to finish it at 12.30 and after that the main business should be taken up. But I must say this honestly that at that time I did not apply my mind to this question and I neither said "Aye" nor "No" to this. I feel now, after hearing the argument of Shri Kamath and after entering into the various aspects of it, that there is something wrong if we put down that this discussion must be finished at 12.30. I do not think it is possible at all to do it. The other question that will arise is, supposing we do adjourn at 12.30 and decide to take interest in it and the House there is the other difficulty, which has already been pointed out, that at 6.00 P.M. there will be nobody present to take interest in it and the House would not be in a mood to take it up. There would be no quorum even. Under those circumstances I think this paragraph 3 will have to be reconsidered. Even if it is assumed that we have adopted it in the Committee, I think it is high time that we reconsider the matter and discuss it fully before taking a decision.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, there is not full appreciation in the House because many of the hon. Members are not aware what exactly is being discussed. Therefore, with your permission I will read it out because otherwise they may vote, under the Whip, against something without knowing what it is.

Mr. Speaker: It is presumed that they have all read it.

Shri Nath Pai: Presumption is not always warranted. Our experience is that they may vote without reading what it is.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: They may vote against you, that they have no confidence in you.

Shri Nath Pai: Sir, I rise to support Shri Kamath's amendment to paragraph 3. Paragraph 3 of the report says:

"The Committee further recommend that miscellaneous items of business included in the list of business for the day which are taken up after the Question Hour should be disposed of by 12.30 P.M. every day and main business for the day taken up at that hour, and in case any item of miscellaneous business is not disposed of by 12.30 P.M. it may be taken up at 6.00 P.M. subject to the approval of the Speaker."

It is said, Mr. Speaker, that the sting of the scorpion lies in its tail. This seems a very innocuous type of recommendation, but it is an extremely dangerous type of proposal that has come and I want to warn the Congress Members to ponder for a minute.

This is, I think, on a par with the earlier efforts that were made when questions were sought to be stifled. This is on a par with that. This is a systematic effort by which the privileges of Parliament, the right of Parliament, the authority or the scrutiny which Parliament exercises on the executive is sought to be surreptitiously curtailed. I am not happy about everything that happens here. I have never for a minute agreed to flout the authority of the Chair. But here is something far more important. Why does it happen? If they want to prevent that kind of thing they should come more prepared, better prepared and honest replies should be given. If disorderly scenes come up, this is not the way of dealing with them. First it was said, questions not to be allowed. That was the effort made earlier. Now another attempt is made through this paragraph. As two senior comrades have already touched upon the subject of your signature being appended to this I do not want to say anything about that. But before I conclude I must say this, that this thing must be resist-

ed factually. Nobody applied his mind. Here is an honest hon. Member, the leader of a party who says that he never applied his mind. This is coming as a unanimous recommendation. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty revealed something even more damaging. Even though she did not attend the meeting herself, she was informed by a member of her party. I have been informed by my representative. It is said that when tea was given and members were on their legs and going, this was casually mentioned. I congratulate him upon the way he can sell such a thing under the counter. When everybody was saying "bye, bye" he mentions it and takes it as adopted. They do not know what they have got round their neck. This is a kind of a sharp practice, I am sorry to say. When they are about to disperse he casually mentions it to you. I have verified it from my representative.

Mr. Speaker: This should not be said that he did not mention it to the Committee, he mentioned it to me. Shri Trivedi has admitted that this was said in the Committee.

Shri Nath Pai: At what stage?

Mr. Speaker: If he mentioned it to me, he did not do it privately to me.

Shri Nath Pai: Members were there when he did say that, but they were at the stage of dispersal. In the first place.....

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): I want to correct a misstatement by Shri Nath Pai. He said that the Leader of the House made that observation at the time of their dispersal, dispersal of the Committee. That is not a correct statement. He started with this suggestion to the Committee and everybody was agreeable. Nobody raised any discussion on that and it was agreed to. That is the position.

Shri Nath Pai: On the agenda this item was not included. It was a suggestion which came from the Minister.

It was a surprise till the last minute. I am, therefore, pleading that this should go back to the Committee. They should not try to hustle it. This is not a simple thing. Give a fair chance to the Business Advisory Committee to ponder over and reflect over it and to reach a mature judgment on it. You should be able to guide them and then they can come here with their recommendation. I hope, therefore, that the amendment moved by Shri Kamath will not be killed by using their majority because this is a dangerous thing.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalappuzha): Sir, Shri Sonavane said that this matter was referred to in the beginning of the meeting. I attended the meeting. Item by item was taken up and in the end he spoke standing up. He was on his legs. Most of us were going out. He was standing and then he mentioned this to you. He asked you to decide how much business could be transacted before 12.30. It was not discussed and we went out. It was not on the agenda circulated to us.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात बिलकुल साफ हो गई है कि यह रपट पूरी कमेटी की रपट नहीं है। मस्य नारायण गिम्हा के जो माथी हैं, शायद उनकी ओर से यह रपट आयी है। विरोधी दल के जितने सदस्य हैं, सभी कह रहे हैं कि बैठक के अन्त में इन मसालों को छोड़ा गया है। इस पर बहस नहीं हुई और इनको "मर्वसम्मति" में स्वीकार नहीं किया गया है। अब मेरा यह निवेदन है और मैं इस रपट का तीव्र विरोध इसलिए करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जो कार्य-प्रक्रिया के नियम हैं उन नियमों की हत्या इस कमेटी की रपट से और विशेषकर जो पार्ट (3) हैं, उससे हुई है। अब वह कौन, यह मैं एक मिनट में आपके सामने साबित करना चाहता हूँ। आप नियम 287 और 288 देखिए। यह इस प्रकार है :

"At the commencement of the House or from time to time, as the

case may be, the Speaker may nominate a Committee called the Business Advisory Committee consisting of not more than fifteen members including the Speaker who shall be the Chairman of the Committee."

अब 288 इस प्रकार है

"It shall be the function of the Committee to recommend the time that should be allocated for the discussion of the stage or stages of such Government Bills and other business as the Speaker, in consultation with the Leader of the House, may direct for being referred to the Committee."

अब इस का क्या मतलब है? विभिन्न विधेयकों या विधेयकों की अवस्था तथा अन्य कार्यवाही। अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज तक बिजनेस ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी का केवल यह काम रहा है कि जो विधेयक है जो सरकार की ओर से प्रस्ताव आता है या सरकार जिन प्रस्तावों को स्वीकार करनी है बहस के लिए उन्हीं प्रस्तावों को ओर विधेयक को समय देने का काम। बिजनेस ऐडवाइजरी कमेटी के सामने रखा जाता था। अब यह जो बीच में मिसलेनियम आइटम्स वाली बात आई है, नियमों में या अध्यक्षीय निर्देशों में, मिसलेनियम शब्द का कहीं भी उल्लेख नहीं है। आपके द्वारा जो निर्देश जारी किये गये हैं, उनकी ओर मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ—यह निर्देश नं० 2 है :—

"Unless the Speaker otherwise directs the relative precedence of the classes of business before the House specified below shall be in the following order,...."

इस में कार्यवाही के विभिन्न वर्गों की चर्चा है, जिस पर आपने निर्देश दिये हैं और इसमें करीब-करीब 28 बातें हैं। मैं इनकी प्रमुख बातों का उल्लेख करता हूँ—जैसे अल्प सूचना प्रश्न

[श्री मधु लिमये]

है। अल्प सूचना प्रश्न को कितना समय दिया जाये—यह काम भी बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी का है? अगर आपने ध्यान आकर्षण प्रस्ताव स्वीकारा है, और उस के ऊपर कई लोगों के हस्ताक्षर होते हैं, आप उस का स्पष्टीकरण के तौर पर सवाल पूछने की इजाजत देते हैं, क्या यह समय भी बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी बांध देगी? उसी तरह में निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न है, तो इस बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी का कोई अधिकार नहीं है इस का समय निर्धारित करने का। मान लीजिए विशेषाधिकार समिति का कोई प्रतिवेदन आता है, तो उस समय नियमों में लिखा हुआ है कि—मैं आपका ध्यान 315 की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ, 315 में लिखा है—

“(1) After the report has been presented, the Chairman or any member of the Committee or any other member may move that the report be taken into consideration, whereupon the Speaker may put the question to the House.

(2) Before putting the question to the House, the Speaker may permit a debate on the motion, not exceeding half-an-hour in duration.....”

तो विशेषाधिकार की रफ्त पर भी साध घंटे की बहस हो सकती है। जैसा कि कामथ साहब ने कहा, खुद बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी की रफ्त पर साध घंटे की बहस हो सकती है, आने वाले सप्ताह की कार्यवाही पर भी चर्चा उठ सकती है, तो इसी तरह इस में कई और बातें हैं, जिनके बारे में समय निर्धारित करने का कार्य मंत्रणा समिति को कोई अधिकार नहीं है। इन के संबंधी अलग अलग नियम हैं, इसलिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने कार्य प्रक्रिया का उल्लंघन किया है। उन को नियमों के अन्दर कमेटी का जो अधिकार नहीं दिया

गया है, उन अधिकारों को हथियाने की कोशिश बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने की है।

दूसरा मेरा निवेदन यह है कि पैरा 3 में जो निर्णय लिया गया है, यह बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने स्वेच्छा से नहीं लिया है, बल्कि बाहर से यह निर्णय बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी पर लादा गया है। उस के सबूत के तौर पर मैं इस बात का हवाला देना चाहता हूँ कि ता. 26 को कांग्रेस मंसूदीय दल की बैठक में यह तय हुआ है, इसके बारे में जो कम्प्यूनिक निकला है, वह मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। इस कम्प्यूनिक में कहा गया था।

“The Committee discussed the procedure to be followed in the next session of Parliament.”

इस कांग्रेस पार्लियामेंट्री दल की कार्य समिति में यह तय किया गया था।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : कार्य समिति ने कुछ तय नहीं किया है।

श्री मधु लिमये : यह आपका कम्प्यूनिक है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : कुछ तय नहीं किया गया।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप कल कहीं बोल रहे हैं। सदन को गुमराह न कीजिये। इन के वक्तव्य में कहा गया है—

“The Committee discussed the procedure to be followed in the next session of Parliament. As the session is a very short one, the members of the Committee felt that no time should be wasted and that the legislative programme of the Government should be carried out as expeditiously as possible. For this purpose, the Committee felt that it was necessary that discipline should be maintained in the House.”

या अनशासन ये जंग रखने वाले हैं, इस का नमूना कल हम लोगों ने देखा। कल आप लोगों को इस सदन से निकालने की नीबत आई थी, लेकिन अध्यक्ष महोदय की मेहरबानी से आपको नहीं निकाला गया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा यह निवेदन है कि बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी के दबाव में आकर, किसी बाहरी ताकत के दबाव में आकर इस फैसले को किया है। इस लिये मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि या तो इस को अस्वीकृत किया जाय, या दोबारा एडवाइजरी कमेटी के पास भेजा जाय, पुनर्विचार के लिए, हर हालत में लोकतंत्र की हत्या करने का...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप खत्म कीजिए।

श्री मधु सिन्घे : 12 वजे के बाद जो महत्वपूर्ण सार्वजनिक सवाल आते हैं, उन पर बहस को खत्म करने का इस कमेटी और श्री सत्य नारायण सिन्हा को कोई अधिकार नहीं है। इनके मंत्री इतने नाभायक और अयोग्य हो गये हैं..... (खयबखन) कि वे "जीरो-अवर" से डरते हैं और भागने की कोशिश करते हैं।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Mr. Speaker....

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I have called the Minister.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): Sir, you should give opportunity to at least some of the Members from this side of the House. I do not think the Leader of the House can reply to everything that they have said. So, some members from this side should be allowed an opportunity to refute the allegations which they have made. They have taken so much time. It would not do much harm to the House if we are also given an opportunity. Further, it would not be doing justice

to the Leader of the House to ask him to controvert all the things that they have said, things that should not have been said things that should not have been brought in. The Leader of the House, because of the status he enjoys, I do not think he can take up all these things. So, some of the Members on this side of the House should be allowed to reply to those points.

श्री राधेलाल व्यास (उज्जैन) : मैं समझता हूँ कि हम लोगों को भी अपनी राय रखने का मौका दिया जाय, हम लोग तो उस में नहीं थे, लेकिन जब यह रेज्योल्यूशन हमारे सामने आया है, तो हमें मौका दें कि हम भी इस सम्बन्ध में अपनी विचार रखें, इस से मैं समझता हूँ कि लीडर आफ़ दी हाउस अच्छी स्थिति में होंगे और फिर अपनी राय रख सकेंगे।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फरुखा-बाद) : आध घंटे से ज्यादा चल रहा है, मुझे तो इस बात की खुशी है....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आध घण्टे से ज्यादा आपने चलाया है या किसी और ने चलाया है? एक तरफ तो वक्त लिया, वक्त खर्च किया और मैं इजाजत देता हूँ तो अब आप मुझे ही कहते हैं कि आध घण्टे से ज्यादा वक्त दे दिया।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं तो खुश हो रहा हूँ, एक घण्टा इनको दीजिये।

श्री स्यासी (देहरादून) : अपोजीशन नोकान्फीडेन्स डिस्कम नहीं करना चाहती, और मामलों को डिगकस नहीं करना चाहती है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : और तीन घण्टे दे दीजिये।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : इस समय जो ठहराव हमारे सामने रखा है, उसके पीछे जो भावना है, वह यह है कि यह लोक सभा का आखरी सेशन है। जहाँ तक बिल बगैरह का सम्बन्ध है, वे इसी सेशन में लिये जा सकते हैं,

[श्री गधेलाल श्यास]

क्योंकि अगले सेशन में बिल वगैरह आने वाले नहीं हैं, सिर्फ बजट आयेगा। जो बिजनेस वगैरह निबटाने हैं, जो वहम करनी है, वह इसी सेशन में कर सकेंगे। अगला अधिवेशन 10-12 दिन का होगा, तथा उसमें ये सब नहीं आ सकेंगे अगर इस अधिवेशन में इन को नहीं लिया जा सके तो कई महत्वपूर्ण काम रह जाते हैं जो कि देश हित में नहीं हैं। इसी भावना को ले कर बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने यह तय किया कि पांच बजे के बजाय छः बजे तक बैठेंगे। बजट सेशन में ही हम लोग छः बजे तक बैठते थे, लेकिन इस विशेष सेशन में इतना टाइम बढ़ाने का उद्देश्य यह है कि काम जल्द से जल्द खत्म हो सके।

रोजाना हम देखते हैं कि हमारा बहुत कुछ उपयोगी समय, एक घण्टा, डेढ़ घण्टा, इस तरह से नष्ट हो जाता है। बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी ने इस में कोई आवाज नहीं किया है हाउस के अधिकारियों पर तथा जो बिजनेस मामलों हैं, उसको भी नहीं सुनाया है। उस में केवल यही कहा है कि साढ़े बारह बजे जो काम चल रहा हो, उसको उस वक्त बन्द करके 6 बजे आपकी अधिकांश दिया है कि आप उनका ले सकते हैं। लेकिन दिक्कत यह है कि आप साहबान 12 बजे तक ही रहते हैं, फिर चले जाते हैं, फिर उस में दिलचस्पी नहीं लेते हैं। वन आपने देखा कि 6 बजे तक कितने अपोजीशन के मेम्बर यहाँ पर उपस्थित थे, ज्यादातर जो मिमलेनियस बिजनेस होता है, उस में इन्टरेस्ट रखते हैं, 6 बजे तक बैठना नहीं चाहते हैं।

इस कमेटी ने जो कुछ कहा है वह रूल 287, 288 के विरोध में नहीं जाता है। जैसा नाथपाई साहब ने, मधु लिमये साहब ने बताया, इस में साफ कहा है—

"It shall be the function of the Committee to recommend the time that should be allocated for the discussion of the stage or stages

of such Government Bills and other Government business...."

इस में यह शब्द हैं :

"The Committee shall have the power to indicate in the proposed time-table the different hours at which the various stages of the Bill or other Government business shall be completed."

जो काम साढ़े 12 बजे खत्म नहीं हो सकता वह 6 बजे लिया जाये, इसमें मैं नहीं समझता कि किमी भी नियम का भंग होता है या विरोधाभास पैदा होगा। सारा बिजनेस लिया जायेगा। सिर्फ साढ़े 12 बजे के बजाय 6 बजे लिया जायेगा। इसलिये बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी का जो ठहराव है वह, मैं समझता हूँ, बिल्कुल उपयुक्त है। खान तोर में इस आखिरी सेशन में, जब कि इतने महत्वपूर्ण बिलों को हमें निपटाना है, हम ने खास तौर से इस के लिये टाइम बढ़ाया है, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी का ठहराव जो है उस को मान लिया जाना चाहिये।

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):
Mr. Speaker, Sir. I have only one thing to say and it is that if paragraph 3 goes, paragraphs 1 and 2 also go because all these paragraphs—1, 2 and 3—are an organic whole, a composite whole, and if anybody wants to lop off the third paragraph, I think, he is trying to upset the whole time-table which is given in paragraph 1. He also wants to go against the wishes of the Business Advisory Committee which are given in paragraph 2.

The Business Advisory Committee is a top-level committee and, so far as I know, the leaders of parties are represented on this Committee. These persons talk about groupism in the Congress, but today I felt distressed when I found that there is groupism in these small, splinter groups also. For instance the leader says there one thing

and his followers say another thing here. This is making me very unhappy and I feel that there should not have been a spectacle like that displayed on the floor of this House.

Again, I would submit respectfully that it is not becoming. Suppose, I am a member of a Committee—any committee—and a decision is taken at 1 p. m. on the 2nd November—I am just giving a hypothetical case—and I come here on the 3rd November and say, "I did not apply my mind to it". I would say that something has gone wrong with the mind and with the gentlemen or person who say that they took the decision in a fit of absentmindedness. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is absentmindedness a characteristic of the leaders of the Opposition parties and can they be permitted to take shelter behind that fit of absentmindedness when something is suggested or bruited about on the floor of this House? I think, this cannot be done.

Moreover, these people say that they are upholding the sovereignty of this House and rights of the Members of this House.

Shri Manoharan (Madras South): He criticizes personalities. I cannot understand that.

Shri D. C. Sharma: You know it, Sir, and I know it what performance they have been giving after the zero hour . . . (*Interruption*)

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri D. C. Sharma: I would submit very respectfully that the whole of paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 should stand as they are because they reflect the common consent of all the parties of the House, they reflect the common wisdom of all the parties of the House and they reflect the democratic procedure.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall not take much

time of the House in this matter because that will go against the spirit of the recommendations which we have made.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): It has already gone.

Shri Nath Pai: It is a mercy.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Fortunately for us you were present throughout. Some of the remarks, which have been made by our hon. friends opposite, have pained me. Somebody said that it was done surreptitiously. I do not know against whom this reflection is meant. The whole thing has come over your signature. Then, some of my hon. friends have said that it is a reflection against the Chair.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The Speaker.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Sometimes, people are more loyal than the king . . . (*Interruption*). When you were speaking, I did not interrupt you. At least have some kind of a decorum. When hon. Members said very hard things, I kept quiet.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You cannot dictate to us. We know what to do.

Shri Hem Barua: Carry on.

Shri Nath Pai: Go ahead.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Everybody has the opportunity to say things.

Our friends should not feel hurt. When they say things . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We do not mind interruptions.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: We do not want to interrupt. I think, it is not a proper thing to interrupt the person who is speaking.

[Shri Satya Narayan Sinha]

Sir, the question of consensus has been raised. This new word, consensus, has come to be in vogue for the last two or three years. Nobody has been able to define what 'consensus' means. I do not know whether it means 'an overwhelming majority' or 'unanimity'.

Shri Hem Barua: He should know the meaning of 'consensus' because this was started by the Congress President, Kamraj.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: That is true. In the light of that, I think, there was a consensus. There was no doubt about what happened there. Only one hon. Member of one party, of course, till the end raised his voice with regard to the allotment of time for the No-confidence Motion—you remember, Sir, he said that the time allotted was not sufficient; that it must be 15 hours or so and I must be fair to him—but the whole Committee, all the Members present there did not agree with it and it came down in the Report like this.

You will bear with me that ever since the Business Advisory Committee has come into existence, even during the time of your predecessor—you used to be present there as the Deputy-Speaker then—I have never used my majority in the Committee and I always left it to the consensus, as you may call it, or the general opinion.

With regard to the third item, to which all our hon. friends opposite have taken objection, you know why it became necessary. We are absolutely constrained. You will agree with me that in the last session—unfortunately for us, Shri Nath Pai was not present in that session; otherwise, he would not have raised his voice like that—sometimes the whole thing went up to 3 o'clock and we were criticized by the press and everybody. The less said about it the better. It is true that when I made this sugges-

tion with regard to this allotment of time, one hon. Member objected. You were present, Sir, and nobody objected when I made this suggestion to the Committee. I do not know whether somebody was absent-minded or kept quiet or had second thoughts.

Shri Hem Barua: Two hon. Members objected.

Shri Umanath: Shri Nambiar came and said that he objected and that you just walked away.

Shri Hem Barua: Shri Nambiar and Shri Peter Alvares objected.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalazhuzha): You should be fair to the House. Was it on the agenda paper? We come to the Committee representing certain Parties. If this issue had been in the agenda, we could have discussed it with our colleagues. It was referred to by the Minister in a casual manner. It was a casual thing. Now you come with a decision. It is very unfair.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: More to you, Sir, than to the House.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: What we have suggested is that after Question Hour . . . (*Interruption*). Cleverness is the monopoly of the hon. Members there . . . (*Interruptions*). Let us calmly think over it in the light of what happened in the last session. All that we have suggested is that after Question Hour, half-an-hour should be spent on Call Attention Notice or something like that, the miscellaneous business, as my friend has tried just to caricature what this 'miscellaneous business' means. We have not said that after half-an-hour, the curtain should be rung down saying, "Nothing doing. Whatever is finished is finished and whatever is not finished should be taken up tomorrow or the day after."

Shri Hem Barua: It says like that.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Many a time it happens that whenever we are taking up an important piece of legislation, we have always done it with the permission of the House or on your own initiative also and something very urgent is taken up. Likewise, we have suggested that after half-an-hour, if you are satisfied that sufficient discussion has not taken place on any item which was being discussed, you can always say that this will be taken up at the end of the day.

I want to allay one fear which they have in mind. It is said that it is a clever move because nobody will be there at 6 O'clock. If this kind of miscellaneous thing, as they call it, is there, there will be no want of quorum. You will always be present in full strength and we will also be present in full strength. That fear is allayed.

I again appeal to the House and submit to them to please, for the sake of conducting official business, give 4½ hours at least for the official business.

Shri Nath Pal: Refer it back to the Committee.

Shri Satya Sarayan Sinha: I am in your hands, Sir. I wanted to explain what happened there. You were the biggest, the greatest, witness there and I have nothing more to say.

Shri Hem Barua: What is the meaning of 'the biggest witness'? (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: About the extension of the time on the motion of No-Confidence, do you want me to put it to the House? How much time do you want?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: We want 15 hours.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the time allotted for the discussion of the No-Confidence motion be increased from 12 hours to 15 hours."

Let the Lobbies be cleared.

The Lobbies have been cleared.

Those who are in favour may say 'Aye'.

Some hon. Members: Aye.

Mr. Speaker: Those who are against may say 'No'.

Several hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The 'Noes' have it...

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: What is this? We walk out in protest... (*Interruptions*).

Shri U. M. Trivedi: When the whole House demands it, why do you want to oppose it. This should never happen when the motion of No-Confidence is being discussed.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You want to dominate by your majority.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: It is not a question of putting it to vote.

Mr. Speaker: What can I do? When there is no agreement, I can only put it to the House.

Shri U. M. Trivedi: I would appeal to the Leader of the House that he must rise to the occasion. This is not an occasion when he should insist on the pound of flesh. On any other occasion, certainly, we would have voted... (*Interruption*). I am not irritated or annoyed. What I am submitting to your good sense, to the sense of justice, is that here is a motion of No-Confidence. It is true that the motion might be against them. But they must be sportsman-like, democratic enough, to agree to this proposal. Let there be 15 hours or 20 hours for it. What is the harm in that?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Except one Member, all our friends had agreed and I agreed to it...

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Still we eat the hump's pie... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: I did not want a division. They wanted a division.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Mr. Speaker, Sir...

Mr. Speaker: Now, the Leader of the House agrees that I might exercise my discretion of increasing the time by one hour. That I will do.

Some hon. Members: That is right.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed, then?

Several hon. Members: It is agreed.

Shri Nath Pal: We do not want them to take away your rights.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Under Rule 292, the House can extend the time further by another two hours or more.

Mr. Speaker: I have got the discretion of increasing the time by one hour.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The House can adopt it.

Mr. Speaker: Now, this is the amendment of Shri Kamath.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Before you put it, I would request you to permit me to take an alternative amendment that this may be referred back to the Committee under Rule 290. Para 3 may be referred back to the Committee.

I beg to move:

"That paragraph 3 of the Fiftieth Report of the Business Advisory Committee be referred back to the Committee for reconsideration."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That paragraph 3 of the Fiftieth Report of the Business Advisory Committee be referred back to the Committee for reconsideration."

The Lobbies have already been cleared.

Lok Sabha divided.

AYES

Division No. 1]

[13.52 hrs.

Bade, Shri
Barua, Shri Hem
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu
Chatterjee, Shri H.P.
Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Kashi Ram
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shankar
Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu
Kandappan, Shri S.

Kapur Singh, Shri
Laxmi Das, Shri
Lohia, Dr. Ram Manohar
Manoharan, Shri
Mate, Shri
Mohan Swarup, Shri
Mohammad Ismail, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Naidu, Shri V. G.
Nair, Shri Vasudevan

Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
Singh, Shri Y. D.
Sivasankaran, Shri
Swamy, Shri M. N.
Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
Umanath, Shri
Utiya, Shri
Venkalah, Shri Kolla
Verma, Shri S. L.
Yudhvir Singh, Shri

NOES

Abdul Rashid Bakshi, Shri
Achal Singh, Shri
Achuthan, Shri
Akkamma Devi, Shrimati
Alagesan, Shri
Alva, Shri A. S.
Alva, Shri Joachim
Ankineedu, Shri
Arunachalam, Shri
Bakliwal, Shri
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Banerji, Dr. R.

Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basappa, Shri
Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
Bhargava, Shri M. B.
Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.
Bisr, Shri J. B. S.
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brij Basi Lal, Shri
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotana
Chandrabhan Singh, Dr.
Chaudhry, Shri Chandramani Lal
Chaudhuri, Shri Sachindra

Daljit Singh, Shri
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri N. T.
Das, Shri Sudhansu
Das, Shri C.
Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dixit, Shri G. N.
Doral, Shri Kasinatha
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.
Gajraj Singh Rao, Shri

Genpati Ram, Shri	Misra, Shri Maheab Dutta	Sarma, Shri A. T.
Ghosh, Shri N. R.	Mohanty, Shri Gokulananda	Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
Gowdh, Shri Veeranna	Morarka, Shri	Sen, Shri P. G.
Gupta, Shri Badaha	More, Shri K. L.	Shah, Shrimati Jayaben
Hanada, Shri	Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda	Shakuntala Devi, Shrimati
Harvani, Shri Atisar	Munzli, Shri David	Sharma, Shri D. C.
Heda, Shri	Muthiah, Shri	Sheo Narain, Shri
Iqbal Singh, Shri	Pandey, Shri R. S.	Shinde, Shri
Jadhav, Shri M. L.	Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath	Shree Narayan Das, Shri
Jaggiwan Ram, Shri	Panna Lal, Shri	Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati
Jumanadevi, Shrimati	Pant, Shri K. C.	Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra	Patel, Shri Chhotubhai	Singh, Shri S. T.
Jyotishji, Shri J. P.	Patil Shri D. S.	Singha, Shri G. K.
Kamble, Shri	Patil, Shri J. S.	Sinha, Shri Satya Narayana
Kelshing, Shri	Patil, Shri T. A.	Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari
Kindar Lal, Shri	Patil, Shri V. T.	Sinhaesan Singh, Shri
Lahtan Chaudhry, Shri	Prabhakar, Shri Naval	Sonavane, Shri
Lalit Sen, Shri	Raghunath Singh, Shri	Soundaram Ramchandran, Shrimati
Laskar, Shri N. R.	Rajdeo Singh, Shri	Subbaraman, Shri
Mahadeo Prasad, Shri	Raju, Shri D. B.	Subramanyam, Shri T.
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.	Ram Sewak, Shri	Sumat Prasad, Shri
Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh	Rampure, Shri M.	Swamy, Shri M. P.
Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra	Rane, Shri	Swaran Singh, Shri
Mansaen, Shri	Ranjit Singh, Shri	Thengal, Shri Nallakoya
Mandal, Shri J.	Rao, Shri Jagannatha	Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad	Rao, Shri Muthyal	Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Maniyangadan, Shri	Rao, Shri Ramapathi	Tiwary, Shri R. S.
Mantri, Shri D. D.	Rao, Shri Thirumala	Tyagi, Shri
Marandi, Shri	Raut, Shri Bhola	Uikey, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri	Reddiar, Shri	Upadhayaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
Maurya, Shri	Roy, Shri Bishwanath	Verakatasubbsiah, Shri P.
Mehdi, Shri S. A.	Sadhu Ram, Shri	Verma, Shri Balgovind
Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari	Saba, Dr. S. K.	Verma, Shri K. K.
Mehta, Shri Jaahvant	Sahu, Shri Rameshwar	Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Saigal, Shri A. S.	Yadava, Shri B. P.
Mishra, Shri M. P.	Sanji Rupji, Shri	

श्री भौर्य (अलीगढ़) : मेरा वोट गलत हो गया है। इसलिए आप नोज से एक वोट घटा कर "हां" में एक बढ़ा दीजिए।

श्री राधेलाल व्यास : मेरी मशीन ने काम नहीं किया है। मैं नोज को तरफ वोट करना चाहता हूं।

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर)
मेरी मशीन ने काम नहीं किया है।

Shri Nath Pai: This is not working.

Mr. Speaker: All these have been taken into account.

The result of the Division is:
Ayes 36; Noes 144.

The motion is negatived. (Interruptions)

The motion was negatived.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am constrained to say that Government is digging Parliament's grave, and murdering Parliamentary rights and privileges. Shame, shame. As a protest, we walk out.

श्री किशन पटनायक : आप मंद को जेल बनाना चाहते हैं। आप मंद को जेल बना लो, लेकिन आप काम नहीं चला पाओगे, यह हम देख लेंगे। अब जूते भी चनेंगे इस सदन में।

[Then Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath and other Members of the Opposition Group left the House.]

Mr. Speaker: I now put Mr. Kamath's amendment to vote.

[Mr. Speaker]

The question is:

"That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'subject to the modification that paragraph 3 of the said report be omitted'."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. Speaker: Now I put the motion that the report as submitted by the Business Advisory Committee be approved by this House.

The question is:

"That this House agrees with the Fiftieth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 2nd November, 1960."

The motion was adopted.

13.54 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS
—contd.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Sheo Narain to continue his speech.

श्री शिव नारायण (वांसी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप का बड़ा अनुगृहीत हूँ कि आपने एक ऐसा विषय इस हाउस में उपस्थित किया कि सारा आपोजीशन साफ हो गया, वे सब उठकर चले गये हैं। उनमें दम नहीं है कि वे अपनी आलोचनाओं का उत्तर मुनें। लेकिन वे लाबीज से मुनेंगे।

13.55 hrs.

[THE DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

नौ महोनों में तीन तीन बार नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन पेश करके आपोजीशन पार्टीज इस का मखोल उड़ा रही है। इस नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन की कोई कीमत नहीं है। वह वेस्ट-पेपर वास्केट में फेंकने लायक है।

हमारे देश में जो विद्यार्थी ग्रान्दोलन आज चल रहा है, उस के बारे में मैं गवर्नमेंट से कहना चाहता हूँ कि विद्यार्थी हमारे देश के भावी नागरिक हैं और हमें उन को इल-ट्रीट नहीं करना चाहिए। पुलिस को यूनिवर्सिटी कम्पाउंड में नहीं जाना चाहिये, हमारे यहां जो यह पुरानी परिपाटी चली आ रही है, उस को कायम रखा जाना चाहिए। मैं श्री चागला की इस बात का समर्थन करता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट को विद्यार्थियों की डिमांड पर विचार करना चाहिए।

मैं आपोजीशन को बताना चाहता हूँ, जो कि पीठ दिखा कर भाग गए हैं, कि हम कांग्रेस वालों में उन से ज्यादा साहस है। हम अपने देश की मुसीबतों और सुख-दुख को सुन सकते हैं और गवर्नमेंट को कह सकते हैं। हमारे बीच में ऐसे लोग हैं, जिन्होंने देश के लिए कुर्बानी की है। हमारे बीच में वे वयोवृद्ध नेता हैं, जिन्होंने यह नारा लगाया था, "शरीबों को मिले रोटी, तो मेरी जान सस्ती है"। यह पार्लियामेंट उस की गवाह है। यहां पर भगतसिंह, राजगुरु और सुखदेव ने बम फेंका था। यह उन के त्याग और बलिदान का प्रतिफल है कि आज कांग्रेस इस देश में पनप रही है, फल-फूल रही है।

हमारे विरोधी दल आज चीप पापुलरिटी गैन करना चाहते हैं और नन्हें विद्यार्थियों को उकसा रहे हैं। मैं डा० लोहिया, श्री एच० एन० मुकर्जी और श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे इस देश के भावी नागरिकों के साथ खिलवाड़ न करें। जहां तक डा० लोहिया का सम्बन्ध है, उन को शिकायत है कि हम पिछड़ गए, हमारी बस छूट गई, कामत साहब पिछड़ गए, उन के साथी आज मिनिस्टर हैं। वास्तव में खलबली और झुंझलाहट तो इस बात की है।

मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह विद्यार्थियों की मांगों पर सहानुभूतिपूर्वक