

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrinani): A statement is laid on the Table. [See Appendix II, annexure No. 90.]

Failures in University Examinations

1115. Shri S. A. Mehdi: Will the Minister of Education be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that there have been large failures in the University Examinations for the last few years; and

(b) if so, whether any research has been made into the causes thereof?

The Minister of Education (Dr. K. L. Shrinani): (a) The statistics available for the years 1953 to 1957 (both inclusive) do not reveal any marked fluctuations in the number of failures in the University Examinations

(b) Does not arise

Survey of Sedimentary Rock in Bareilly-Shahjahanpur Area

1116. Shri S. A. Mehdi: Will the Minister of Steel, Mines and Fuel be pleased to state:

(a) whether any survey has been conducted in Bareilly-Shahjahanpur area about sedimentary rock;

(b) if so, the nature of the survey, and

(c) if not, when it will be done?

The Minister of Mines and Oil (Shri K. D. Malaviya): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) One party carried out seismic reflection survey along Bareilly-Shahjahanpur road to obtain information on the sub-surface structural features.

(c) Does not arise.

Damage to Huts in Jheel Kuranja

1117. Shri P. C. Borooah: Will the Minister of Home Affairs be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that all the huts of slum dwellers in Jheel

Kuranja, Delhi were destroyed or blown up by the dust storm on the 26th June, 1959;

(b) if so, the nature of the damage caused; and

(c) whether any action has been taken against the contractor for this faulty construction?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. B. Pant): (a) No.

(b) and (c) Do not arise.

12 hrs

RE MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: Now, papers to be laid on the Table.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Maharajganj): I had given notice of an adjournment motion, and it has been disallowed..

Mr. Speaker: I have disallowed it.

Shri S. L. Saksena: But this is not a question of

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may resume his seat; he will kindly hear me. Any hon. Member who is not satisfied and wants to make representations can do so; there is no hurry; he will make representations to me, and if I am satisfied, I shall bring it up. Any hon. Member whose adjournment motion is disallowed or to whose adjournment motion I do not give my consent may see me that very evening between 4 P.M. and 8 P.M., and if I am satisfied, I shall bring it up the next day. First, let me be satisfied.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): May I make a submission to you? We have gone through the earlier records, and we find that whenever adjournment motions were disallowed, at least whether it was within the purview of the Parliament or not had always been stated both by you, Sir, and by your predecessor, Shri G. V. Mavalankar. I have been looking through the earlier debates.

[shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

I find that in the case of an adjournment motion on 30th June, 1952, the very same question had come up. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy said:

"Sir, I had given notice of an adjournment motion."

The Speaker said:

"I communicated to the hon. Member that I do not give my consent to it."

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy then asked:

"May I know the reason?"

The Speaker then gave a long reason as to why it had not been allowed. He did not read out the actual text of the adjournment motion, but he gave the reason. I have gone through so many other rulings also, and I find that in all those cases we were at least told that the matter was not within the purview of Parliament, and that was why it had not been allowed.

But, in recent times, we have been told that there is absolutely no need to give any reasons as to why an adjournment motion has been ruled out or disallowed. In view of the fact that conventions and rules guide you, I would like to know what conventions are being set up in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: Very well. The hon. Member has not unfortunately tabled an adjournment motion today. Today, I had received two adjournment motions. I have a list containing about twenty or more reasons which make an adjournment motion inadmissible. I tick off one or two reasons, which indicate the grounds on which I have disallowed the adjournment motions. I have now adopted this practice which gives the reasons indicating under which of those items I have disallowed an adjournment motion. I have given the reasons in the case of the adjournment motions that I have received today, and the hon. Members concerned have got them. Therefore, this representation is not necessary here.

Shri S. L. Saksena rose—

Mr. Speaker: So far as Shri S. L. Saksena's adjournment motion is concerned, I have already explained the position; I have always said that whenever I come to the conclusion that an adjournment motion is not permissible, and I do not give my consent, it is open to the hon. Members to come and tell me that very evening; and if I am satisfied, I shall bring it up the next day. Otherwise, if we enter into a discussion here, the very object of disallowing is removed, and there is no meaning in that. When I say that this is not a matter which ought to be discussed here, if hon. Members say that I must bring it up here and they must discuss it, then the very object of disallowing or withholding of my consent is gone.

I am prepared to give the hon. Member an opportunity to satisfy me. If I am satisfied, I shall bring it up the next day. This is the procedure that I am going to adopt, and that is what I have done today.

Shri T. B. Vittal Rao (Khammam): May I make a submission? We have to state here whether it is a matter of urgent public importance. Without giving us a chance to state that, without giving us an opportunity to advance our reasons as to why we consider it to be a definite matter of urgent public importance, if you disallow it straightway, then we are helpless in that respect.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. Hon. Members *prima facie* have to judge whether it is a matter of urgent public importance or not. To that extent, I have got a discretion also. It is not as if I am denying the privilege of tabling an adjournment motion here in every case. Wherever I have got a doubt, I shall bring it up. But hon. Members ought not to take upon themselves the question of deciding whether they are in the right or I am in the right. (Interruptions).

I have already consulted the leaders of the various groups, and this is the

procedure that has been evolved. It is open to me to give or not to give my consent. Without my consent, no adjournment motion can be moved in this House. It is open to me *prima facie* to come to the conclusion whether I should give my consent or not, and therefore, even without bringing it up here, I can disallow. That is the first category. The second category is wherever I have got a doubt, I bring it up here for the purpose of satisfying myself whether I should give my consent or not, in which case, I hear a brief statement from one side and also from the other. The third category is where I am satisfied that consent ought to be given, in which case I ask fifty Members to rise in their seats, and if fifty Members are prepared to support, then I give my consent for that adjournment motion.

Whoever is not satisfied with my *prima facie* rejecting an adjournment motion without bringing it up here, can always represent to me, it is not as if he is denied every opportunity. He can come and represent to me, if he does not want to see me, he may write to me. If I think there are reasonable grounds for me to change my opinion, I shall waive the question of time, and I shall bring it up the next day. This is the procedure that we have adopted, so as to enable hon. Members to make representations and also to enable me to carry out what exactly has been prescribed under the rules, namely that for giving my consent, I must be satisfied *prima facie* that there is a case. Therefore, no hon. Member is denied the privilege of moving an adjournment motion, he can always make representations to me.

Shri S. L. Saksena: In this case, I have said that the Vice-Chancellor of the Banaras Hindu University has made over the institution to the police.

Mr. Speaker: There cannot be an exception in the case of the hon. Member just now.

Shri S. L. Saksena: This is an obvious fact.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. There is no harm; I am equally aware of all that.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): You were pleased to say whose satisfaction was the material point whenever a question of urgent public importance had to be raised. This question was raised even in 1952. At that time, one hon. Member wanted to know whether in a matter which in his own judgment was one of urgent public importance he was not entitled to bring it to the notice of the House. Subsequently, we find that a long ruling was given. The Speaker said that it was for the Member to decide whether it was important or not, and that if he was satisfied that it was a matter of urgent public importance, he was at perfect liberty to give notice of an adjournment motion, then, it was for the Speaker to withhold his consent or give his consent. When he withholds his consent, he gives the reasons, whether it is an exclusively State matter and so on.

Mr. Speaker: I have given the reasons in all these cases. I need not read them out here. It does not mean that I must give the reasons in the open House. I have given the reasons to the hon. Members concerned, and they must be satisfied, if they are not satisfied, let them make further representations to me.

Shri Tangamani: The other day, you were pleased to disallow an adjournment motion.

Mr. Speaker: Now, I have changed my view.

Shri Tangamani: where no reason was given.

Mr. Speaker: Order order. Hon. Members were not satisfied with my stating that there were not sufficient grounds for giving my consent to an adjournment motion. They wanted to know on what grounds I was disallowing an adjournment motion. I have now considered this matter. I have now considered this matter. On the spur of the moment, it is difficult to indicate every reason. Now, I have

[Mr. Speaker]

prepared a list of all the grounds on which an adjournment motion is disallowed. I have tabulated all those reasons; they are about twenty or twenty-two in number; I disallow on one or the other of those grounds. Therefore, hereafter, there need be no question as to whether the grounds have been stated or not; the grounds are given to the hon. Members. But I do not make the adjournment motion public, until I give my consent here.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: I beg of you to consider this matter again. Since we have had already a Parliament for the last seven years, and some conventions have grown up, could we not reconsider this whole matter again, go into the convention again and then come to an understanding with the leaders of groups, because otherwise, every day, new rulings are coming up, and we do not know where we are.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member has got very short memory. She was there when I called a meeting in my Chamber of all the leaders and representatives of various groups, and we evolved this procedure that it is open to me to give my consent or not; and if I do not wish to bring it up here or I do not like that I should bring it up here, I withhold my consent and intimate to the hon. Members accordingly.

Now, hon. Members want to know the grounds also. I have since tabulated all the grounds under which an adjournment motion can be rejected. I tick off one or two of those grounds under which I do not give my consent.

We had agreed also that in certain cases where an hon. Member feels that the matter is very important, if he obtains the signature of the leader of his group, I shall bring it up before the House; otherwise, I shall not do so. It is open to an hon. Member to come and satisfy me that I must change my view regarding my consent

in which case, I shall certainly bring it up the next day.

Regarding certain other adjournment motions, wherever I have a doubt, I shall bring them up here. If I feel that it is very important; I shall ask the hon. Member concerned to enlighten me about the matter.

In the third case, I give my consent.

This is the procedure that has been evolved. We spent some time over it. The hon. lady Member was herself the representative of her party. She sat with me (*Laughter*), and we evolved this particular procedure. If day by day we go on establishing new conventions, I do not know where the previous conventions will stand. Now, let us proceed.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: On a point of personal explanation. I think, a very wrong idea has been given to this House; and of course, this House starts laughing at everything. I would just like to say that we should like to have the minutes of this meeting or convention, because I feel absolutely aghast that we have come to this decision, and I do not seem to know about it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will certainly have a copy of the minutes.

Now, papers to be laid on the Table

Shri S. L. Saxena: The reasons have been given that in this case, it is a question of law and order in the Banaras Hindu University.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will kindly satisfy me whether it is a question of law and order or not, this afternoon.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): Apart from this adjournment motion, may we have some information about this? There was a reference by the hon. Minister earlier to the bringing forward of an amendment to the Banaras Hindu University Act. May we know what has happened to that?