

CHAPTER—18

Calling Attention

Absence of adjournment motion in Rajya Sabha

A provision to move an adjournment motion for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, which was largely analogous to the procedure prevailing in the House of Commons, U.K., was made for the first time in 1920, in the Indian Legislative rules for the Legislative Assembly to be constituted under the Government of India Act, 1919. The Rules were applicable to both the Houses of the Central Legislature namely, the Legislative Assembly and the Council of State. Sub-rule (1) of rule 11 of those rules provided:

Subject to the provisions of sub-rule (2) of rule 22, a motion for an adjournment of the business of either chamber for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance may be made with the consent of the President.

However, in 1952, when House of the People and Council of States were constituted, the adjournment motion provision was retained in the House of the People rules only on the ground that the Council of Ministers was responsible to House of the People alone under article 75(3) of the Constitution. The omission of the provision of adjournment motion in the Council of States rules was, however, made good by the inclusion of a procedure of moving a “motion for papers”, in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States.¹

As early as 1952, the Rules Committee of the Council of States considered a suggestion that the Council of States Rules should also contain a provision enabling members to move an adjournment motion. In support of the suggestion, an opinion was expressed that the Council of States was not merely a revising body. Except in money matters it had equal powers with the House of the People. However, a contrary view was that as under the Constitution, the Council of States had no financial powers and the Council of Ministers was in express language responsible only to the House of the People, the function of the Council of States should be merely supervisory, and that instead of moving an adjournment motion, the Council should follow the technique perfected by the House of Lords of moving a motion for papers, on which the Council could discuss any matter of real public importance and which conferred the right of the reply on the member moving the motion.²

In a note regarding questions and adjournment motions in Second Chambers prepared by the then Secretary of the Council of States at the suggestion of the Committee, it was observed:

Such motions (adjournment motions) are by their very nature moved almost invariably by members belonging to parties in opposition to the Government. Accordingly, an adjournment motion is ordinarily taken as a motion for censuring Government. It has, therefore, been considered inappropriate to include any provision with regard to the moving of such adjournment motion in the Council of States especially in view of article 75(3) of our Constitution under which the Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the House of the People. The conditions under which a motion for papers may be permitted have been made less stringent than the conditions under which an adjournment motion may be moved in the House of the People. Accordingly, it has been thought that a motion for papers will be a better substitute for a motion for adjournment in the Council of States.³

On 16 May 1952, which was the second sitting of the Council of States, clarifying about the Rules of Procedure, the Chairman observed:

...there are no Adjournment Motions in this Council because generally Adjournment Motions indicate censure of the Government or dissatisfaction with the Government. But the same purpose is served by Motions for Papers. That is also the procedure which prevails in the House of Lords. So, instead of Adjournment Motions, we have Motions for Papers.⁴

Old procedure of Motion for Papers

Before the present rule 180 was incorporated in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, the only device available to members to draw the attention of the Government to an urgent matter of public importance was by means of a motion for papers which was then provided in the old rule 156.⁵ The procedure for motion for papers was akin to the procedure prescribed in the House of Lords for motion of papers. In the House of Lords, it is a common practice to add at the end of a notice giving a subject for debate the words “and to move for papers”. This is usually done in order that there may be a motion before the House and that the mover may have an opportunity of replying to the debate. It is recognised that such a motion should normally be withdrawn, since it is treated as a neutral motion and there is neither advantage nor significance in pressing it.⁶

The rule (156/175) relating to the “motion for papers” read as follows:

(i) Any Member desirous of raising discussion on a matter of urgent public importance may give notice of a “motion for papers” and specify clearly and precisely the matter to be raised.

(ii) If the Chairman is satisfied after calling for such information from the member who has given notice and from the Minister as he may consider necessary that the matter is urgent and of sufficient importance to be raised in the Council at an early date he may admit the motion and fix the date on which such motion may be taken up and allot such time for its discussion not exceeding three hours as he may consider appropriate in the circumstances:

Provided that, if an early opportunity is otherwise available for the discussion of the proposed matter, the Chairman may refuse to admit the motion.

(iii) If, at the end of such a discussion the motion is not by leave of the Council withdrawn or the Minister states that there are no papers to be laid on the Table or if the papers are available they cannot be laid on the Table on the ground that it will be detrimental in the public interest to do so, it will be open to any member to move an amendment, recording the opinion of the Council on the matter, in such form as may be considered appropriate by the Chairman.

(iv) An amendment, if moved, will be put to the Council without discussion unless the Chairman in his discretion thinks it to allot further time for the elucidation of any matters arising out of the amendment.

(v) In other respects rules governing the admission and discussion of a "motion for papers" shall be the same as for motions on matters of public interest with such modifications as the Chairman may consider necessary or convenient.

The practice followed was that since the prime intention of providing the procedure for "motion for papers" in the rules was only to enable a member to raise a discussion on an important and urgent issue, the Chairman, instead of admitting the "motion for papers" as such, would permit a member just to raise a discussion without any formal motion or admit such discussion in some other form such as a motion on a matter of public interest or by way of a ministerial statement, etc. In other words, there was not a single occasion when a "motion for papers" was formally admitted and discussed in the House.

Introduction of calling attention procedure

The Committee constituted to recommend Draft Rules of Procedure under article 118(1) of the Constitution, took note of the feeling among some members that the procedure relating to "motion for papers" was so stringent that in practice it was found difficult to get any notice admitted under this procedure. It, therefore, recommended, *inter alia*, that a provision should be made in the Rajya Sabha Rules enabling members to give notices

of calling attention to matters of urgent public importance. The Report which was presented on 29 November 1963, was adopted by the House on 2 June 1964 and the new procedure of calling attention came into effect from 1 July 1964.⁷

The following observations of Shri Bhupesh Gupta, a member of the Committee made in the note appended to the Report of the above-mentioned Committee on the introduction of calling attention and short duration discussion procedures are apt:

Our House does not have provision for adjournment motions although there are Upper Houses where such adjournment motions are allowed, e.g., the Upper Houses of Canada, Australia and Eire. Of course, in the House of Lords in the U.K., no such provision is there, but the Rajya Sabha is no House of Lords! Therefore, the prevalent notion that the Upper Houses cannot have any adjournment motion is wrong. It is not necessary to link up the adjournment motion always with the question of no-confidence or of the resignation of the Government. Our House has undoubtedly suffered all these years as a result of absence of provision for adjournment motion or of some effective substitute provision for raising discussion on matters of urgent public importance. Rule 176 would remove to some extent these handicaps, provided discussions under it are allowed as frequently as possible. It is hoped that this rule would not turn out to be another dead letter like the old rule about the "motion for papers". In this matter, I would like the Rajya Sabha not to lag in any manner behind the Lok Sabha. On the contrary, it should be our endeavour to be more alert and assertive in taking up discussion under this rule and making the rule a really living one.

It is earnestly hoped that the rules under Chapters XIII and XIV would go considerably to enhance the role of the House as well as its stature in the eyes of the people. Practice and conventions will have their part to play.

Provisions in rule 180

A member may, with the previous permission of the Chairman, call the attention of a Minister to any matter of urgent public importance and the Minister may make a brief statement or ask for time to make a statement at a later hour or date. No member shall give more than two such notices for any one sitting. There shall be no debate on such statement at the time it is made. Not more than one such matter shall be raised at the same sitting. In the event of more than one matter being presented for the same day, priority shall be given to the matter which is, in the opinion of the Chairman, more urgent and important. The proposed matter shall be raised at 2.00 p.m. and at no other time during the sitting of the House.⁸

Procedure for giving notices

A member who desires to call the attention of a Minister to a matter of urgent public importance has to give notice in writing in the prescribed form addressed to the Secretary-General. In order to facilitate preliminary examination of such notices and to avoid delay, a copy of the notice is required to be endorsed each to the concerned Minister and the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.⁹ The notice and the two copies thereof are required to be delivered in the Rajya Sabha Notice Office. Copies intended for the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and the concerned Minister are collected by the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and transmitted to the concerned Ministry. This enables the concerned Minister to get an advance intimation of the notice so that he may, if necessary, apprise the Chairman of the factual position regarding the matter proposed to be raised in the notice, which in turn enables the Chairman to decide the admissibility of the notice. So far as the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is concerned, the advance intimation enables his Ministry to coordinate between the concerned Ministry or Department of the Government and the Rajya Sabha Secretariat in the matter.

In pursuance of certain decisions taken at the meetings of the (i) Rules Committee held on 19 June 1978 and 16 May 1979, (ii) General Purposes Committee held on 21 March 1975 and (iii) leaders of parties and groups with the Chairman held on 3 August 1970 and 21 August 1970, an announcement was made by the Chairman in the House on 23 May 1979, and a Bulletin was issued informing members about the practice and procedure to be followed regarding calling attention.¹⁰ Since then at the commencement of each session a Bulletin is issued informing members regarding the procedure to be adopted while giving notice of a calling attention.

Members can give notices as soon as the summons of the session is issued.¹¹ The notice is to be given by 10.30 a.m. on the day on which the matter is proposed to be raised in the House. All calling attention notices received for a day during a week in which that day falls are kept alive for the whole week and are placed before the Chairman for his consideration from day to day.¹²

The earlier practice was to keep the notices alive till the end of a session in respect of a particular subject admitted in so far as clubbing of names was concerned. The Rules Committee considered the matter and recommended that the calling attention notices should be kept alive till the end of the week only.¹³ An announcement was accordingly made in the House.¹⁴

The Committee had also proposed that a sub-rule be added to rule 180, to provide that notices not accepted by the Chairman should lapse at the end of the sitting.¹⁵ The House, however, did not agree to the recommendation.¹⁶

On the last day of the week on which the House sits, the notices which have not been selected by the Chairman are deemed to have lapsed. No intimation about this is given to members.¹⁷ The Rules Committee recommended:

At present members whose calling attention notices are not accepted by the Chairman, are informed accordingly. The Committee feels that this is unnecessary. It will suffice if the admitted notice is displayed on the Notice Board for the information of members.¹⁸

Not more than two notices of calling attention may be given by a member for any one sitting.¹⁹ This provision was added to rule 180 on the recommendation of the Rules Committee which observed:

Many a time members give a number of notices on different subjects for a particular day. The Committee is of the opinion that the number of notices which a member may give for a particular day, should be restricted to two only.²⁰

However, notices on the same subject can be given by more than one member jointly or severally.

Admission of a notice

The power to admit or disallow a notice of a calling attention rests with the Chairman. The decision concerning the admission of a calling attention or disallowing it rests with the discretion of the Chairman.²¹ The admission of a notice is subject to the rules and the judgement of the Chairman that the matter sought to be raised calls for an early statement from the Minister. Urgency and public importance of the subject-matter are the two basic criteria for admission of notices of calling attention. The Chairman takes a decision on merit depending on these two criteria and selects for admission one subject from amongst several ones, notices for which are given by members for every sitting of the House. The Chair may not be able to accommodate a subject “merely on the principle that there must be a calling attention” or “for the sake of filling up the time and have a calling attention” every day.²²

In the process of admitting a notice it may happen that a subject may not be taken up in the Rajya Sabha even when a similar subject is discussed in the other House by way of a calling attention.

On 14 August 1968, some members mentioned in the House that a calling attention regarding police excesses in certain towns of Uttar Pradesh of which notices had been given had not been admitted and expressed

views about the admission of notices. On 19 August 1968, the Chairman, *inter alia*, referring to the proceedings of 14 August 1968, gave the following ruling:

Members have sometimes represented to me that calling attention notices tabled by them have been disallowed. They should appreciate that I receive on an average about fifteen to twenty calling attention notices for every sitting and that under the rules only one of the notices can be admitted for a day.

When I admit one notice and withhold permission for the others, members should not feel that I have not appreciated the urgency or importance of the subject-matter of those notices. I consider all the notices and select one of them for admission and withhold permission for others. Members will agree that this power of deciding which of the many notices shall be admitted must rest with me and my judgement should be accepted by the House.

Sometimes members have complained to me that a calling attention notice has been disallowed in the Rajya Sabha, though a notice on the same subject has been admitted in the other House. All that I may say on this point is that I take an independent decision on merit, depending upon the urgency and importance of the subject-matter of the notice and taking into consideration the relative importance and urgency of the several notices on various subjects received by me and in that process it may happen that a notice may not be admitted in our House, though a notice on a similar subject has been admitted in the other House. The House will agree with me that such a situation is sometimes inevitable.²³

When on an occasion, the Chairman called Special Mentions, on a point of order, a member complained that there had been only two calling attention notices admitted in the session and the House was not discussing important and urgent issues, the Chairman ruled out the point of order and observed:

It is in the discretion of the Chair to accept and admit calling attention. He will have to balance the work of the Government and of the administration. If he finds that there is time after dealing with the important issues like the Finance Bill and all that, he would certainly give time. But the Chair cannot and will not give precedence to calling attention over the Finance Bill and Government Business.²⁴

It is not necessary that a calling attention notice must be admitted for every sitting of the House.

On 4 December 1971, due to Pakistani aggression, it was decided while changing the time of sittings, that there would be no "Question Hour" or "Calling Attention" from that day till the rest of that Session (78th).²⁵

On 21 July 1975, during the 93rd Session which was called mainly to approve the Proclamation of Emergency and other related matters, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms and Department of Parliamentary Affairs moved the following motion which was adopted after discussion:

This House resolves that the current session of the Rajya Sabha being in the nature of an emergent session to transact certain urgent and important Government business, only Government business be transacted during the session and no other business whatsoever including calling attention and any other business to be initiated by a private member be brought before or transacted by the House during the session and all relevant rules on the subject in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha do hereby stand suspended to that extent.²⁶

Again on 3 November 1976, the following motion moved by the Minister, was, after discussion, adopted:

This House resolves that the current session of the Rajya Sabha being in the nature of a special session to consider the Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Bill, 1976, and certain unavoidable and essential Government business, only Government business be transacted during the session and no other business whatsoever including Questions, calling attention and any other business to be initiated by a private member be brought before or transacted in the House during the session and all relevant rules on the subject in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha do hereby stand suspended to that effect:

Provided that after the disposal of the said Constitution Amendment Bill, time permitting, the Chairman may in his discretion allow calling attention and Short Duration Discussion.²⁷

Earlier the motion given notice of by Government did not contain the proviso.²⁸ Later, the Minister concerned gave notice of the above quoted motion in supersession of the earlier one.²⁹

On 26 March 1985, when a member complained that the entire session (133rd) which commenced on 13 March 1985 “there has not been even one Calling Attention...Rajya Sabha has become a Special Mention Sabha,” the Chairman stated, “... in view of the pressure of work, members of the Business Advisory Committee had agreed not to have any calling attention during these two weeks.”³⁰

Any member whose notice stands disallowed or lapses at the end of a week can revive his notice for a subsequent week by giving a fresh notice and the Chairman reconsiders such a notice along with other notices. Such a procedure enables the Chairman sometimes to admit a notice which he could not admit on an earlier day or week because of priority having been given to some other notice, or for any other reason.³¹

Non-admission of a notice

As stated earlier, the Chairman has full discretion to admit or not to admit a notice of a calling attention. He is also not bound to give any reasons for his decision in the matter.

A member complained, on a point of order, that he had given notice of a calling attention which was rejected, but in the Lok Sabha that matter was discussed. The Chairman observed, "If you give notice of a calling attention and if it is rejected, there cannot be a point of order on that".³²

On 15 and 16 March 1989, at the beginning of Question Hour members raised a matter about non-admission of their calling attention regarding revelations in a newspaper about the assassination of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. The Chairman ruled, "After the fullest consideration of all aspects of the matter I am entirely convinced that the matter of calling attention should not be admitted". When a member wanted to know the reasons, the Chairman observed, "Under the rules I am not obliged to say all this... But I am doing so to reassure you that I am satisfied that this calling attention motion is not admissible on very valid and noteworthy grounds... In taking this decision, I have kept in mind all aspects...including particularly the human aspect and unquestionable norms of fair play and justice".³³

Modification of a notice and its transfer to a Minister

Members may give notices on substantially the same subject but word them differently and sometimes address them to different Ministers according to the emphasis of a subject. This may entail consolidation of all notices relating to the same subject or modification or reframing of the notices to reflect a common or comprehensive view contained therein or make the notices otherwise admissible. As far as possible, however, the language of the calling attention as given by a member in his notice is substantially retained.

The admitted version of the calling attention regarding the IB Report on use of foreign funds contained, *inter alia*, a reference to Communist countries. A member, on a point of order, objected to the reference and wanted deletion of the reference. The Chairman overruled the objection observing, "I have admitted it and therefore you cannot say anything now."³⁴

A calling attention was admitted on the "reported unilateral revaluation of rouble by the State Bank of USSR in relation to its rupee value and its adverse massive impact on repayment of credits to the Soviet Union." A member, on a point of order, asked whether it was proper that when the negotiations were still on, the calling attention was proceeded on the basis which in its the language, came to the conclusion

that there was already a negative or adverse impact. He felt that the language of the calling attention was very unhealthy. The Deputy Chairman made the following observations:

As far as the language...is concerned, it is given by certain members and I do not think we can change the language of the motion, except in cases where the language is either imputing motives or things like that.³⁵

On another occasion, when a member stated that he had signed a calling attention notice of a different nature, the Chair observed, "it (*i.e.*, subject notice) is always reframed."³⁶

A calling attention notice given by some members for discussing the alleged misuse of State machinery at the Kisan Rally held in New Delhi on 16 February 1981, was admitted in the form of 'reported expenditure of diesel for organising of Kisan Rally at New Delhi on 16 February 1981'. On a point of order about the scope of the calling attention, the Deputy Chairman observed, "...the Chairman has admitted this calling attention...on a subject that was given by the hon'ble members... The essence of the motion must be expressed here. I think they must have referred to the use of diesel and other things also. So he has included a wide range— 'expenditure of diesel' in connection with the Rally. So far as the Rally is concerned, we are not going to discuss the Kisan Rally. That is not Government's job. The Government cannot reply for a party."³⁷

On an occasion, a calling attention regarding serious threat to India's security combined the following five, though related, matters to make the subject comprehensive (a) U.S. moves to establish naval bases in Sri Lanka; (b) establishment of Chinese naval bases near Karachi; (c) arms deal between Pakistan and U.S. arms manufacturing companies; (d) Saudi Arabia's financial help to Pakistan to purchase U.S. arms; and (e) Pakistan's plans to acquire nuclear weapons. A point of order objecting to such a procedure was ruled out by the Chair.³⁸

The Chairman may also transfer or allocate a notice to a Minister other than the one to whom the original notice is addressed by the member.

A calling attention regarding reported recovery of Chinese balloons with transmitters and propaganda materials found in different parts of the country and the activities of the foreign-trained guerillas and other lawless elements in Manipur was admitted and addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs. After the Minister made a statement in response to the calling attention, points were raised that the original notice contained 3-4 specific matters and was addressed to the Minister of External Affairs. The Deputy Chairman agreeing with the member who called the attention observed:

What we normally do and what seems to have been done in this case also is that a number of motions on a subject or on related subjects

are clubbed together... Since this motion had ramifications which concerned the External Affairs Ministry also, we had, on our own, sent a copy to the External Affairs Ministry, so that the Minister of State for External Affairs, if he wanted, to be here and intervene if he so chose.³⁹

A calling attention regarding situation arising out of the postponement of the bye-election to the Lok Sabha in the Garhwal parliamentary constituency was originally addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs but at the admission stage it was transferred to the Minister of Law & Justice, and members concerned were informed accordingly. Subsequently, the Chairman after having received a communication from the Minister of Law & Justice directed that the calling attention should be reframed in a general form, namely, "inadequacies in the electoral law in not providing a specific period for completion of a bye-election to Parliament". Accordingly, the calling attention in the revised form appeared in the list of business for 25 November 1981. When the matter was taken up, members raised a spate of points of order objecting to the substantial revision of the calling attention and its transference to the Minister of Law & Justice, instead of the Minister of Home Affairs to whom they had addressed. After the Minister of Law & Justice explained the position, the Deputy Chairman clarified the matter thus, "The Chair has got the right to reframe any calling attention submitted by the members in any phraseology... This has been the practice in the House in the past also. When several calling attention notices are given, then the Chairman decides and certain basic issues are included. The phraseology is always decided by the Chairman". After some further points, when the Deputy Chairman asked the first member in whose name the calling attention stood to call the attention he started reading his original notice addressed to the Home Minister. The Deputy Chairman did not permit, observing, "Only the notice printed on the order paper will go on record". After the Deputy Chairman directed that the Home Minister would also be present in the House throughout the debate, the calling attention discussion commenced.⁴⁰

A calling attention regarding collapse of flyover under construction in connection with Asiad in New Delhi was admitted to be responded by the Minister of Railways. A member contended that the three Ministers were involved, namely, Railways, Works & Housing and Shipping & Transport. The Chairman pointed out that the calling attention was addressed to the Minister of Shipping & Transport but because the bridge was being constructed by Railways, the calling attention was addressed to it. He further said:

There were so many notices received about the collapse of the bridge. Some members directed it to Minister of Shipping & Transport and some to others. The overall construction of bridge is under the charge of Railway Minister so it will go to him... When there are so

many notices received in different phraseology but the main subject is one, they are clubbed together. If the members insist that their phraseology should not be changed, then they will suffer. Only one name will be identified and the names of the rest will not be mentioned because their phraseology is different, may be the subject is the same.

The calling attention was accordingly replied by the Minister of Railways although the Minister of Shipping & Transport who was present also clarified some points.⁴¹

A calling attention on wages of journalists and assault on them was addressed to the Minister of Information and Broadcasting and admitted for 5 December 1983. It was subsequently restricted to recent incidents of harassment of and assault on journalists only and addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs.⁴²

Priority of notices

The relative priority of the notices on a subject-matter which has been admitted by the Chairman, is determined according to the time of their receipt, in the case of separate notices. In the case of a notice jointly signed by several members, the sponsoring member gets precedence over all other members who have signed the notice. Names of all members who have given the notices jointly or severally on the same subject-matter are then entered in the list of business under the item of calling attention. There have been innumerable instances when an item of calling attention has appeared in the names of a large number of members. Some of the subjects which have been raised by way of calling attention by several members (numbers given in the brackets) are:

Reported statement of Prince Aga Khan regarding situation in Bangladesh (60),⁴³ hunger strike by Shri M.N. Govindan Nair, M.P. for judicial inquiry in police firing at Agra in May, 1978 (102),⁴⁴ atrocities on Harijans (74),⁴⁵ remunerative prices for wheat, etc. (65),⁴⁶ unemployment (55),⁴⁷ inadequate prices for paddy (57),⁴⁸ plight of farmers (51),⁴⁹ remunerative prices for agricultural produce (65),⁵⁰ remunerative prices for farmers (55),⁵¹ remunerative prices for sugarcane growers (75),⁵² and (61),⁵³ communal situation (61),⁵⁴ and scrapping of Cryogenic Rocket Engine deal by Russia (51).⁵⁵

Nonetheless, the number of signatories to a calling attention notice is not the determining or decisive criterion for acceptance of a calling attention by the Chairman. On a number of occasions, notice of a calling attention subject given by only one member or two or three members has been admitted. The Rules Committee considered but did not agree to a suggestion that names of members under a calling attention item should be restricted to five, to be determined by ballot.⁵⁶

As recommended by the Business Advisory Committee, names of members giving notices of a subject subsequent to its admission on the basis of earlier notices from other member/members are not considered for inclusion in the list of business, as was the previous practice.⁵⁷

A member whose calling attention notice has not been selected during a week may renew the same for a subsequent week or weeks. In such a case, the date and priority of the notice is the date and time at which the renewal notice is received in the Secretariat from the member concerned and no consideration is given to his original or previous notice on the same subject, which has lapsed at the end of a week or otherwise.

A member raised a point of order regarding admission of a calling attention on prices of sugarcane on 14 December 1981, that on the very subject he had given notice two weeks ago which was not admitted but a late-stage notice given by other member(s) was admitted. Another member suggested that in such a case consideration should be given to earlier notices also and names of members giving such earlier notice should come first. The Deputy Chairman informed him about the procedure that a notice lapsed after a week and it had to be renewed for the next week and if it was not renewed then the name of the member was not added.⁵⁸

Lapse of a notice

As stated earlier, notices of calling attention not admitted till the last day of a week on which the House sits, lapse. A notice of calling attention given by a member also lapses if he ceases to be a member of the House by the expiration of his term in the Rajya Sabha even though he has been re-elected and had given notice of the calling attention during his previous membership.

A member complained that his name was excluded from a calling attention admitted for 3 April 1970. He stated that the ground for such omission, namely, that he retired on 2 April 1970 was not valid inasmuch as when the calling attention was admitted in his as well as other members' names he was a member of the House. He ceased to be a member at 12 O'clock midnight. The Chairman did not accept his contention and ruled that the notice which the member had given lapsed with the termination of his membership. At the time when the agenda started there was no notice from him.⁵⁹

Intimation about an admitted notice

After the Chairman has selected a subject for a calling attention, members who have given the notices, the concerned Minister/Ministry and the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs are informed immediately on telephone as well as through a letter about admission of calling attention notice and

the schedule date on which it would be taken up in the House. If the subject-matter of the calling attention or any of its aspects falls within the jurisdiction of more than one Minister, a copy of the admitted calling attention is sent to each of them so that all the concerned Ministers may be present during the discussion and deal with the aspects concerning them. The admitted calling attention is also published in Parliamentary Bulletin Part-II for information. An item in that regard thereafter appears in the list of business for the day for which the notice is admitted.

More than one Calling Attention on a day

(i) Two calling attention matters

Not more than one calling attention matter can be raised at the same sitting.⁶⁰ In the event of more than one matter being presented for the same day, priority is given to the matter which is, in the opinion of the Chairman, more urgent and important.⁶¹ There have been a number of instances when more than one calling attention matters have been admitted and raised on the same day and in such cases more urgent and important matter was taken up first and the second one later during the day of the sitting of the House.

In early days, the practice followed in the event of two calling attention matters being admitted for a day was to take them either one after the other as listed⁶² or take the first after questions and the second after the laying of papers on the Table and disposal of some business like Minister's statement or a Government Bill.⁶³ In later days, the practice was to take up the first calling attention after the questions and laying of papers on the Table and the second one towards the end of the day's sitting.⁶⁴

On some occasions, two calling attention matters relating substantially to the same subjects were raised by two members separately on the same day one after the other. For instance, two calling attention matters regarding (i) inadequate food supplies to West Bengal and (ii) loss of foodgrains in transit from Bombay to Calcutta were raised and the concerned Minister gave a combined statement in two parts.⁶⁵

On another occasion, two calling attention matters which were raised one after the other by two members related to (i) refusal of manufacturers to buy wool imported from Australia by the State Trading Corporation and (ii) increase in prices of wool. In the former case a statement was laid on the Table and in the latter case the statement was made by the concerned Minister in response to the calling attention.⁶⁶

(ii) *Three calling attention matters*

On two occasions, three calling attention matters were also admitted for a sitting.

On 17 May 1966, three calling attention matters were raised and they related to (a) breakdown of power supply in Delhi, (b) attempt on the life of Shri G.M. Sadiq, Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir at Baramulla on 16 May 1966 and (c) attempt on the life of Shri Mehr Chand Khanna, Minister of Works, Housing and Urban Development.

On 2 September 1966, the three calling attention matters which were raised related to (a) massing of troops by Pakistan on our borders, (b) indiscriminate use of Defence of India Rules in Assam and (c) reported statement of the Chief Minister of Assam regarding anti-national and subversive activities in his State. The first two matters were taken up one after the other. In respect of the third one, the Minister concerned asked for time of a few days to make the statement. It was accordingly, made on 5 September 1966.⁶⁷

Time for taking up Calling Attention

Till 30 June 1972, the procedure was to take up calling attention immediately after Question Hour and before any other item listed for the day in the list of business was taken up. The Rules Committee considered a suggestion that the formal business of laying papers on the Table of the House should be taken up immediately after the questions, and that only after the papers were so laid, should the calling attention be taken up. The suggestion was made on the ground that it would enable Ministers to attend to their official duties after laying the papers instead of waiting in the House for an uncertain time till the calling attention was over. The Committee agreed with the suggestion and recommended an amendment in rule 180(5) accordingly.⁶⁸ The amendment was adopted by the House on 1 June 1972.⁶⁹ The amendment became effective from 1 July 1972.⁷⁰ The Rules Committee also considered but did not agree to a suggestion that a calling attention should be taken up at 5.00 p.m.⁷¹ As per the amended rule, the proposed matter was raised after the questions and the laying of papers, if any, on the Table and before any other item entered in the list of business was taken up and at no other time during the sitting of the House. Accordingly, the item of calling attention was shown in the list of business immediately after the questions and the papers to be laid on the Table.

On 3 September 1991, in the course of the discussion on the working of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, the Vice-Chairman announced that the debate would be concluded that day except the reply of the Minister which would be made the next day. A member

pointed out that there would be a calling attention on the atrocities against Harijans and other weaker sections which would take the whole of the next day. If at all the Minister had to reply, let him do so first, immediately after Question Hour, before the calling attention was taken up; otherwise he would not be able to reply on that day. The Vice-Chairman stated that the debate would go on till 7.00 p.m. and the Minister would reply the next day.⁷² Accordingly, the list of business for 4 September 1991, listed further discussion on the working of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting over the item about the calling attention. A point of order was raised with reference to rule 180(5). After some discussion, the Deputy Chairman called the Minister to reply and the calling attention was taken up afterwards.⁷³

The Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held on 11 May 1992, recommended that the amendment made by the Lok Sabha in the Constitution (Seventy-second Amendment) Bill, 1992, be taken up for consideration on 12 May 1992, before the calling attention.⁷⁴

On 27 July 1993, when the Deputy Chairman called the concerned Minister to lay on the Table a copy of the statement necessitating promulgation of an Ordinance followed by the introduction of a related Bill, a point of order was raised with reference to rule 180(5). The point of order was upheld and the calling attention was taken up.⁷⁵

When some members suggested that the short duration discussion on the affairs of BCCI, which had remained inconclusive on Saturday, 14 September 1991, should be taken up first and the listed calling attention regarding price situation afterwards, a member expressed serious objection to this under rule 180. The Vice-Chairman ruled that the short duration discussion would be taken up after the calling attention.⁷⁶

As mentioned earlier, till 26 November 2014, the procedure was to take up the calling attention after the questions and the laying of papers on the Table and before any other item in the list of the business and at no other time during the sitting of the House. Following the adoption of the 13th Report of the Committee on Rules by the House on 26 November 2014, the calling attention is now taken up at 2.00 p.m. The amendment came into effect from 27 November 2014.⁷⁷

Postponement of Calling Attention

As earlier stated, the calling attention is taken up on the day it is listed. However, it may be necessary that the calling attention may be postponed to some other time on the same day or subsequent day either on the request of the concerned Minister⁷⁸ or for other pressing business of the House.⁷⁹ If an item has already appeared in the list of business and is postponed under the direction of the Chairman, then the same is deleted in the revised list of business, if issued, and the House is apprised accordingly.

However, there are many instances when a calling attention matter had been taken up at some other time of the sitting of the House after taking the sense of the House on a Minister's request or due to exigency of the more important business in the House, viz., after the disposal of a Government Bill or a motion under consideration,⁸⁰ after the lunch recess⁸¹ or after the disposal of private members' business,⁸² or towards the end of a sitting.⁸³

On a request from the concerned Ministers that they were busy in the other House, the Chair announced that the calling attention would be taken up later in the day.⁸⁴

On an occasion when the member concerned called the attention of the Minister of Iron and Steel to the demand for the location of a steel plant at Visakhapatnam, the Deputy Minister stated that it was an important statement to be made and that it would be better made by the Minister himself who was shortly arriving by plane. He, therefore, requested the Chairman to allot some time in the afternoon that day. The Chairman fixed 4.30 p.m. as the Minister "could not get a seat in the earlier plane".⁸⁵

The Deputy Chairman announced on 31 August 1981, that the calling attention regarding the alleged collection of funds by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra for a trust would be taken up on the next day. On 1 September 1981, however, instead of that calling attention, another one regarding the power crisis in the country was listed. When the matter was raised, the Leader of the House explained that because certain facts had to be ascertained from the State Government, one day's extension of time was sought which the Chairman had granted.⁸⁶

The Chairman informed the House that the calling attention regarding agitation of farmers for remunerative price for cotton was being postponed in view of Government motion on the IMF loan that day.⁸⁷

The Deputy Chairman announced that the Home Minister would very much like to reply to the calling attention regarding elections to the Delhi Metropolitan Council and the bye-election in the Garhwal parliamentary constituency, although the Law Minister to whom it was addressed was present. Since the Home Minister was busy in the other House the Deputy Chairman postponed the calling attention to 3.00 p.m. that day.⁸⁸

The Deputy Chairman informed that the calling attention regarding inadequate supply of foodgrains to the States by the Centre had been postponed to some other day. Points were raised by members objecting to the eleventh hour postponement. The Leader of the House explained the position of non-availability of the concerned Minister who was out of station.⁸⁹

The Deputy Chairman informed that the calling attention regarding occurrence of epidemic dropsy in certain parts of Delhi would be taken up at 4.00 p.m. No reasons were given.⁹⁰

A calling attention was listed originally for 4 March 1986, in the list of business issued on 28 February 1986. It was deleted from the revised list of business. The Chairman explained that it was postponed so that members could have more time to participate in the discussion on the Motion of Thanks.⁹¹

A calling attention was taken up at 5.00 p.m. as 'some members were anxious to go to receive a distinguished visitor and would not be able to participate in the discussion of the calling attention'.⁹²

Mode of Calling the Attention

On being called by the Chair, the member whose name appears first in the list of business under the item Calling Attention to a Matter of Urgent Public Importance, rises in his seat and calls the attention of the Minister mentioned in the item by reading out the text as given in the list of business. Only the text printed on the order paper goes on record and nothing extraneous that a member may introduce while reading the notice is permitted.

A calling attention was admitted on the reported refusal by Government to refer the following demands of the Central Government employees to arbitration, namely, (a) merger of DA with pay; (b) grant of need-based minimum wage to Central Government employees; and (c) the reported decision of the Confederation of the Central Government Employees to embark on a strike. The member, in whose name the calling attention stood, asked for permission not to read the third part of the item because it was not submitted by him in his notice. The member's objection was that the particular organisation was only a paper organisation and had no representation on the Joint Consultative Committee. The member also stated that he had read upto (b) and the Chairman could allow anybody else to read out the rest. When the Chairman called the second member in the list to read out, another member contended that it was a new precedent, the first portion to be read out by one and the rest by some one else. The Chairman suggested that the member in whose name the calling attention stood should read out the next portion also as he did not want two or three members to read it. Thereafter, the member read part (c) also.⁹³

A member while calling the attention stated: "May I call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the question which I have raised about the agitation in support of the 'Sati' system in Rajasthan and Delhi". A member rising on a point of order stated that "the calling attention was not properly presented to the House. Calling Attentions have to be introduced in the same words in which they appear in the

Order Paper". The Deputy Chairman asked the member concerned to read the item again.⁹⁴

A member while calling the attention of the Minister started reading from his original notice instead of the text as given in the list of business. The Chair did not permit him to do so.⁹⁵

When a calling attention regarding the difficulties of the people due to inadequate supply of essential commodities was called, members raised extraneous issues. The Deputy Chairman did not permit.⁹⁶

If the member, on being called, is absent or does not wish to call the attention, the member listed next below, if any, is called. At this stage he does not ask for any clarification.

Circulation of copies of the Statement in the Chamber

As per the established practice, copies of the statement of the Minister which he proposes to make in response to the calling attention are made available to the members just before the Minister starts reading it. Both the versions—English and Hindi—are required to be made available.⁹⁷

During early days, it was not the practice to circulate copies of the proposed statement of the Minister beforehand. On an occasion, after the Minister made a statement in response to a calling attention, a member suggested that when an important issue was raised and the Minister made a long statement, "care should have been taken to circulate it beforehand so that members could follow the points; otherwise there was no use of discussing because it was a long statement". When the Chairman explained the practice, another member suggested that as the Minister started speaking, it could be circulated at least to those who had tabled the calling attention.⁹⁸ When such a suggestion was repeated in 1982, the Deputy Chairman observed that there was no such practice, however, it could be considered for the future.⁹⁹

Statement by the Minister in response to Calling Attention

(a) Statement to be made

After a member has called the attention of the Minister, the Minister concerned may make a brief statement or ask for time to make a statement at a later hour or date. Ordinarily, as per the practice, the Minister reads a prepared statement in response to the calling attention.

On an occasion, when the Minister, instead of reading the prepared statement, wanted to respond extempore, the Chair ruled that it was not the procedure and the Minister had to read the statement.¹⁰⁰

The statement may be read by a Minister of State even though the Cabinet Minister in-charge of the Ministry concerned with the subject-matter of the calling attention is present in the House.

A point of order was raised that the initial statement in response to a calling attention regarding communal riots in the country should be made by the Prime Minister, who was also the Home Minister and was present, instead of the Minister of State. The Chairman ruled, "According to rules, joint and several responsibility is there. The Minister, who is here, can do the same. If he finds some difficulty, automatically the Prime Minister will reply at the appropriate time...There is no point of order because either of them, the Minister of State or the Cabinet Minister, can reply".¹⁰¹

Even if the subject of a calling attention may apparently fall within the purview of a Minister other than the one mentioned in the list of business, it is for the Government to decide who will deal with a particular calling attention.

When a calling attention regarding nuclear threat faced by India in the context of Pakistan's move to acquire and develop nuclear weapons was about to be responded by the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, a member suggested that it should have been dealt with by the Defence Minister. The Chairman observed, "It is for the Government to decide who will deal with it".¹⁰²

If the subject-matter of a calling attention or any of its aspects falls within the jurisdiction of more than one Minister, a copy of the admitted calling attention is sent to each of them so that all the concerned Ministers may be present during the discussion and deal with the subject in so far as any of its aspects concerns them.

A calling attention regarding the strike of LIC employees was replied by the Minister of Finance. However, when some members contended that the Minister had not dealt with the demands of employees and when the Minister of Finance stated that he had received the notice only the last night and the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation who was also present stated that he had not received the notice at all, the calling attention was postponed to give proper notice to both the Ministers. Accordingly, on the postponed day both the Ministers clarified the points falling in their respective jurisdictions.¹⁰³

A calling attention notice regarding the reported recovery of Chinese balloons with propaganda materials in many parts of the country was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs and a copy thereof was also endorsed to the Minister of External Affairs "so that the Minister of State for External Affairs, if he wanted to be here and intervene if he so chose".¹⁰⁴

A calling attention notice which was initially intended to deal with the postponement of the Garhwal bye-election and addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs, was rephrased in a generally-worded subject and addressed to the Minister of Law. Upon some members objecting to this, the Deputy Chairman directed that the Home Minister should also be present in the House throughout the debate. The discussion on the calling attention commenced thereafter.¹⁰⁵

(b) Statement may be laid

While responding to a calling attention generally the Minister concerned has to make a statement, on occasions he may be permitted to lay a copy of the statement on the Table in response thereto, and members may seek clarifications thereon later. In some cases, the Minister may make a brief statement or clarify the salient points contained in the statement and lay the detailed statement on the Table, with the permission of the Chair.

A calling attention regarding strike in Government of India Press came up at the fag-end of the sitting. The Minister laid on the Table the statement in response thereto and members sought clarifications thereon the next day.¹⁰⁶

A member called the attention of the Minister of Law to the Supreme Court judgement regarding the validity of the Punjab Appropriation Acts. When the Minister was about to read the statement, the Deputy Chairman pointed out that the statement was about eight pages and sought the views of members whether it should be read or laid on the Table. The House agreed that the matter was technical and legal and the statement could be laid and clarifications thereon could be sought later on.¹⁰⁷

At the request of the Minister, the calling attention regarding attempt of USA, UK and USSR to establish naval bases in the Indian Ocean came up at 4.00 p.m. But due to members raising another matter, the Minister could not make the statement. It was permitted to be laid.¹⁰⁸

The statement in response to the calling attention regarding the strike and lockout in HMT in Bangalore consisted of eight pages. The Minister wanted to know whether he should read only the concluding paragraphs since the strike had ended. The statement was permitted to be laid and the Minister gave broad facts of the matter.¹⁰⁹

The Minister of Finance made a brief statement in response to the calling attention regarding the large scale disinvestment in public sector undertakings and with the permission of the Deputy Chairman laid a more detailed statement on the Table. The statement ran into thirteen cyclostyled pages which had an annexure also.¹¹⁰ Clarifications on the statement were taken up after a few days.¹¹¹

A member called the attention of the Minister of Health and Family Welfare to the situation arising out of casualties during clinical trials in the country and the issues related thereto. Due to repeated interruptions in the House, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare laid the statement on the Table of the House with the permission of the Deputy Chairman. After statement was laid, the House was adjourned for the day.¹¹² Similarly, Minister of External Affairs was allowed to lay a statement in response to the calling attention regarding the repeated attacks on Tamil Nadu fishermen by Sri Lankan Navy due to continuous interruptions in the House. After statement was laid, the House was adjourned for the day.¹¹³

(c) *No separate Statement in response to Calling Attention*

On occasions when Ministers made statements *suo motu* on matters of public importance and the Chairman admitted calling attention on the same subject-matters subsequently, Ministers did not make statements again in response to the calling attention. The statements already made formed the basis of discussion on the calling attention.

On 18 March 1980, when the Chairman indicated that the Home Minister was going to make a statement on the burning of the Harijan huts in Moradabad, a member raised a point of order that since he had already given notice of a calling attention on that subject, the Minister had no right to make a statement before taking up the calling attention which was likely to be admitted for the next day. When the Chairman suggested that the Minister might postpone his statement till then, the Leader of the House relying on rule 251 stated that the Minister had a right to make a statement on the floor of the House on a matter of public importance irrespective of the fact whether a calling attention notice was pending or not. The Chairman agreed and stated that he would permit full debate on the subject the following day. This, however, did not satisfy the members. The House was adjourned earlier than the scheduled lunch-recess for consultation in the Chairman's Chamber. After the House reassembled, as directed by the Chairman, the Minister was permitted to make the statement. The calling attention was taken up on the next day. The Minister, however, did not make a fresh statement in response thereto, except adding some factual information to his earlier statement.¹¹⁴

The Minister made a *suo motu* statement on killings of Harijans in Mainpuri (U.P.). A calling attention on the same subject was admitted on the next day. The Minister did not make any statement again in response thereto saying that he had nothing more to add to what he had already stated in the statement on the previous day. Thereafter, members sought clarifications.¹¹⁵

The Minister made a statement on the situation in Punjab. Members demanded that there should be a discussion thereon. The House agreed that the statement would be taken up as in response to a calling

attention and members would seek clarifications thereon. No separate statement was made in response to the calling attention, nor was the calling attention formally called, though the list of business listed the item in the names of members from whom notices for calling attention and the order in which requests for clarifications on the previous day's statement of the Minister were received.¹¹⁶

The Minister made a statement regarding increase in the prices of petroleum products. A calling attention on the same subject was admitted on the next day. No separate statement was made in response to the calling attention. However, for technical purposes, the calling attention item was listed in the list of business. The member was asked to formally call the attention of the Minister and thereafter members sought clarifications thereon.¹¹⁷

However, on occasions, a Minister has made a *suo motu* statement on a subject, the Chairman admitted a calling attention also on that subject for a subsequent sitting and the Minister has again made a new statement in response to the calling attention.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs made a statement on 13 March 1968 regarding stabbing of Justice A.N. Grover of the Supreme Court. A calling attention on the same subject was admitted for 14 March 1968 and the Home Minister made a statement in response to the calling attention.¹¹⁸

On 10 May 1968, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs made two statements—one regarding the judgement of the Punjab and Haryana High Court in respect of the Punjab Appropriation Acts of 1968 and the other regarding refusal of the High Court to issue a stay order in the matter. A calling attention on the constitutional crisis in Punjab arising out of the High Court's judgement holding the Appropriation Acts *ultra vires* was admitted for 11 May 1968 and the Minister of Home Affairs made a statement in response to the calling attention.¹¹⁹

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs made a statement on 7 March 1969 regarding the Address delivered by the Governor of West Bengal to the members of both Houses of West Bengal Legislature on 6 March 1969. A calling attention on the constitutional implications of the Centre's attitude in regard to the demand for the recall of the Governor of West Bengal was admitted for 7 March 1969. The Minister of Home Affairs made a statement in response to the calling attention.¹²⁰

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs made a *suo motu* statement regarding premature retirement of the Director of Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie on 5 March 1982.

The Deputy Chairman informed that a calling attention on the subject would be taken up on 8 March 1982. Accordingly, when it was taken up another Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs made a fresh statement in response to the calling attention¹²¹ which was more or less similar to the earlier one.

(d) Postponement of time to make a Statement

As earlier stated, the Minister may ask for time to make a statement at a later hour or date.

When a member was about to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the observations of the Supreme Court regarding use of DIR, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs stated that he would be available to make the statement only at 5.00 p.m. that day. When the concerned member objected to this, the Chairman stated, "The Government are entitled to ask for time and I have allowed them to make the statement at 5 O'clock".¹²²

The calling attention regarding explosion of hydrogen bomb by China was admitted for 20 June 1967. The Minister of Defence requested that he be permitted to make the statement next day 'before the House rises' because he was making the statement in the other House also that day. The Chairman announced that the statement would be made at 2.30 p.m. that day. A member raised a point regarding postponement of the calling attention on the ground mentioned by the Minister. After some objections, the Chair assured that it would be made at 12.00 Noon the next day. It was accordingly made.¹²³

The Deputy Chairman announced that the calling attention regarding shortage of wagons for lifting oranges at Nagpur would be taken up at 2.00 p.m. as requested by the Deputy Minister of Railways on the ground that information sought in the calling attention was neither available in the Railway Board nor with the Headquarter of Central Railway at Bombay and the same had to be collected from the Divisional Manager, Nagpur. By the time the House was deciding, the concerned Minister came to the House and reiterated the position. The Deputy Chairman quoting rule 180 conceded the right of the Minister to ask for time but observed, "Ministers should be ready with the information when they are informed and they should not usually and unnecessarily ask for any postponement".¹²⁴

As agreed at a meeting of leaders with the Deputy Chairman, the calling attention regarding alleged collection of funds by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra was formally taken up on 1 September 1981. The Minister of Finance stated that he would make a statement on the next day since he was getting all the facts. The statement was accordingly made on 2 September 1981.¹²⁵

Calling Attention of an absent member

If the member or members in whose name(s) the calling attention stands is or are absent or he or they decline to call the attention as per the text in the list of business, the practice followed in the matter of making or laying on the Table the statement by the Minister has not firmly settled. Sometimes the statements have been laid;¹²⁶ at other times this has not been done.¹²⁷

The concerned member, when asked to call the attention (regarding exodus of architects), sought to make submissions instead of calling the attention. The Deputy Chairman did not permit but the member continued to speak which was ordered not to be recorded. The member next listed when asked, also did not do so. The Deputy Chairman declared, "There is no business now. The Minister can go" and proceeded to the next item in the list of business.¹²⁸

The only member in whose name a calling attention regarding sugarcane prices stood, was not present. When another member pleaded that the Chair should use the discretion and permit other members to seek clarifications, the Deputy Chairman declined pointing out that only the member in whose name the calling attention stood had the right to raise it; thereafter, only others could ask questions. Since the member was not present, the calling attention could not be taken up.¹²⁹

When members in whose names a calling attention regarding inadequate supply of essential commodities stood, started raising extraneous issues instead of calling the attention, the Deputy Chairman did not permit them. The calling attention could not be taken up that day or on any other subsequent day.¹³⁰

Procedure for seeking clarifications

There can be no debate on such statement at the time it is made.¹³¹ However, members are permitted to seek clarifications on the statement. A member who initiates a calling attention first seeks the clarification. He is not to take more than seven minutes and other members who are called by the Chairman are not to take more than five minutes each and should restrict themselves strictly to seeking clarifications on the statement and avoid making long speeches.

In July 1979, it was decided that the time allotted to the initiator of a calling attention should not be more than five minutes.¹³² The procedure was reviewed at a meeting of the leaders held on 19 June 1980 and it was decided that a member who initiated a calling attention should not take more than seven minutes. The Chairman announced in the House accordingly.¹³³

Order of calling members for seeking clarifications

Where a calling attention stands in the names of a number of members, in choosing members who desire to seek clarifications, the first principle is party/group. After exhausting the parties/groups, whose members have given the notices by calling one member from each party/group, the Chairman may call members belonging to parties/groups not in the list.¹³⁴ In other words, names of members are not called in the order in which they appear in the list of business nor is it obligatory for the Chairman to call all those whose names appear in the list of business. So far as small groups are concerned, the Business Advisory Committee recommended, *inter alia*, that one member from each party or group consisting of at least five members should be permitted to seek clarifications. A group of less than five and Independents and others should be represented by one member by rotation.¹³⁵ However, when this recommendation was announced, some members expressed their reservations to the adoption of this practice.¹³⁶

The Business Advisory Committee at its meeting held on 16 July 1991, considered the procedure to be adopted for seeking clarifications on a calling attention and recommended that the earlier practice of permitting one member from each party/group to seek clarification on a calling attention be adhered to.¹³⁷

On an occasion, the Chair observed that after six speakers from the list had spoken he would give opportunity to each of the other parties also.¹³⁸ On another occasion, the Chairman observed, "I am trying to see that every political party represented here gets a chance. I cannot allow three or four people from the same party to get up and speak."¹³⁹ On an occasion, the Deputy Chairman observed, "Following an earlier convention, I have called one from every party. There are five members from the Congress Party, I have called one."¹⁴⁰

The following illustration will explain the practice being followed in calling members to seek clarifications.

Illustration

Suppose on a calling attention, there are fifteen members whose names appear in the list of business in the following order—

The first three belong to a party 'A', the next two belong to a party 'B', the next four belong to a party 'C', the next two again belong to the party 'A', the next one belongs to a party 'D', the next two belong to a party 'E' and the last one again belongs to the party 'B'.

The first member belonging to the party 'A' will first call the attention and after the Minister's statement in response, ask for clarifications. Other members of the same party in the list will not be called and the next member to be called will be from the party 'B' and so on.

Only after exhausting a member each from each of the parties reflected in the listed calling attention item, other members' requests for being called may be entertained by the Chair. If any party's Leader/Whip desires to substitute a member whose name does not appear in the list for a member whose name appears, the new member takes his turn after exhausting all the names already in the list and not at the place of the member of his party who figures in the list.

In this context, the Rules Committee considered a suggestion that names of members under the calling attention item should be restricted to five to be determined by ballot and only those members whose names appear in the list of business should be called to seek clarification and none else merely on the basis of party list. As directed by the Committee, the suggestion was circulated to leaders of various parties and groups in the Rajya Sabha for eliciting their views. The leaders did not agree to the suggestion. The Rules Committee, therefore, recommended that the existing practice of clubbing of names and calling members to seek clarifications on a calling attention might continue.¹⁴¹

Postponement of clarifications

Sometimes in view of the importance of the subject or with a view to enabling members to study a statement made by the Minister in response to a calling attention, the House may decide to defer seeking of clarifications thereon.¹⁴²

Time-limit for seeking clarifications

At a meeting of leaders of parties/groups held with the Chairman in August 1970, it was decided that a member who initiated the calling attention should not take more than five minutes and the time to be given to the other members for seeking clarifications would be within the discretion of the Chair.¹⁴³ Subsequently, at a meeting of the leaders held on 19 June 1980, with a view to streamlining the procedure, the broad consensus arrived in regard to the time-limit for seeking clarifications was that a member who initiated a calling attention should not take more than seven minutes and other members who would be called by the Chair should not take more than five minutes each and should restrict themselves strictly to seeking clarifications and avoid making long speeches.¹⁴⁴

Reply to clarifications

Till early eighties, generally the practice was that the Minister had to give reply separately to each clarification asked by a member.¹⁴⁵ Sometimes, however, the House used to agree to the Minister giving one reply at the end of all clarifications.

On an occasion, it was suggested that in view of the importance of the subject-matter of the calling attention, namely, communal riots in the country with particular reference to incidents in Aligarh, the Prime Minister should reply to all the clarifications at the end. This was agreed.¹⁴⁶

On another occasion, the Chairman announced that the calling attention should be finished in one hour as agreed by leaders and nobody should take more than five minutes to speak. Shri B.N. Banerjee, former Secretary-General who then was a member stated, "In the Calling Attention the usual practice is that members speak and the Minister replies. Since you are limiting time to enable members to express their views, it will be better that the members may speak and as a special case the Minister replies at the end." The Chairman directed the Minister to make a note of points and give one consolidated reply.¹⁴⁷

At a meeting of the leaders held on 15 September 1981, it was agreed that as a special case, the Minister would reply at the end of all the clarifications.¹⁴⁸ On 20 October 1982, the Deputy Chairman announced at the beginning of a calling attention on strike in Delhi University:

It has been agreed that members will make their observations, put their questions and clarifications and reply at the end once only... that has been agreed by all the parties ...the leaders have agreed.¹⁴⁹

But again in 1983, the previous practice of giving individual reply to each clarification was revived.¹⁵⁰ On one occasion, a suggestion for a consolidated reply was not even agreed to.¹⁵¹ On 15 March 1983, for sometime separate replies were given and at the suggestion of the Vice-Chairman, towards the end, a consolidated reply was given to clarifications "due to need to conserve time".¹⁵² On 21 December 1983, after the first reply to the clarifications sought by the member who had raised the calling attention, at the suggestion of the Deputy Chairman, a consolidated reply was given to the other members' clarifications.¹⁵³ On an occasion, members sought clarifications on one day and the Minister replied on a subsequent day.¹⁵⁴ On another occasion, which was perhaps the solitary one, after the House discussed the calling attention for nearly three and a half hours the discussion was stopped as the concerned Minister had to go to the Lok Sabha for voting on the no-confidence motion there. The discussion remained inconclusive.¹⁵⁵

The current practice which has been settled since 1984 is that after members seek clarifications on the statement of the Minister, he gives a reply to all of them together at the end.¹⁵⁶

Correcting the statements or further clarifying points

On occasions, Ministers have also made further statements correcting their earlier statements made in response to or during the course of a calling attention or for further clarifying points. Such statements have been either made or laid on the Table of the House, after the conclusion of a listed calling attention, if any, or immediately after questions.

On 3 April 1967, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance made a statement regarding certain matters raised in relation to the statement made by him on 29 March 1967, in response to a calling attention about the renewal of contract of a Publicity Consultant to the Indian Embassy, Washington.¹⁵⁷

On 18 August 1967, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals made a statement regarding assurance given by him in the course of replies to certain points arising out of a calling attention matter raised on 31 July 1967.¹⁵⁸

On 28 August 1970, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs made a statement correcting his earlier statement made in response to a calling attention on 3 August 1970.¹⁵⁹

On 3 September 1970, the Deputy Minister of Finance made a statement correcting his earlier statement in response to a calling attention on 19 May 1970.¹⁶⁰

On 4 September 1970, the Minister of Education and Youth Services laid on the Table a statement correcting his earlier statement made in response to a calling attention on 10 August 1970.¹⁶¹

On 11 November 1970, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals and Mines and Metals made a statement correcting replies given by him to certain questions arising out of the statement made in response to a calling attention on 17 March 1970.¹⁶²

On 30 July 1971, after the disposal of the listed calling attention a member was permitted to seek clarifications on the discrepancies between replies given during the calling attention statement by the Minister of Steel and Mines in the Rajya Sabha on 10 June 1971, and answer given to the unstarred question no. 472 in the Lok Sabha on 27 May 1971, on the issue of industrial licences for the setting up of mini steel plants in the private sector. The Minister concerned replied to the points raised.¹⁶³

Time for conclusion of Calling Attention

At a meeting of leaders of parties/groups in the Rajya Sabha in 1970 it was decided, *inter alia*, that normally no calling attention should exceed thirty minutes and in any case it should be disposed of before the House

adjourned for the lunch-recess. The General Purposes Committee recommended that not more than one hour should be taken for the purpose. After that period was over, it should be left completely to the discretion of the Chair whether or not to allow any other member who desired to participate in the discussion. In any case, a calling attention should be so arranged that all the miscellaneous business on the list of business, other than the legislative or other regular business, should be disposed of before the House adjourned for the lunch-recess.¹⁶⁴

Notwithstanding these recommendations, there have been many occasions when calling attention matters have continued beyond the lunch-recess of the House, or for the whole day or spilled over to the next or subsequent day¹⁶⁵ depending on the importance of the subject or the consensus in the House. Some of the important calling attention matters which have occupied four hours or more were:

Strike of Development Officers of LIC (4.04 hrs.);¹⁶⁶ disturbances in Jamshedpur (two days - 9.38 hrs.);¹⁶⁷ arms aid to Pakistan by USA (4.34 hrs.);¹⁶⁸ communal incidents in and around Bihar Sharif (4.32 hrs.);¹⁶⁹ irregularities in grant of income tax exemptions to certain Trusts in Maharashtra (two days - 5.32 hrs.);¹⁷⁰ mass conversion of Harijans to Islam in Tamil Nadu (4.46 hrs.);¹⁷¹ inadequacies in electoral law (4.00 hrs.);¹⁷² violence and vulgarity in films (4.30 hrs.);¹⁷³ floods and drought (4.00 hrs.);¹⁷⁴ developments in J&K (6.08 hrs.);¹⁷⁵ non-implementation of the Punjab Accord (4.11 hrs.);¹⁷⁶ agitation of GNLf (4.43 hrs.);¹⁷⁷ engagement of Fair-fax agency (5.16 hrs.);¹⁷⁸ functioning of media (4.16 hrs.);¹⁷⁹ communal incidents (5.00 hrs.);¹⁸⁰ inadequate supply of essential commodities (5.24 hrs.);¹⁸¹ communal situation (three days - 9.14 hrs.);¹⁸² plight of handloom weavers (4.17 hrs.);¹⁸³ price situation (4.53 hrs.);¹⁸⁴ drought situation (4.37 hrs.);¹⁸⁵ bomb explosions in Bombay on 12.3.1993 (6.20 hrs.);¹⁸⁶ situation in J&K (5.22 hrs.);¹⁸⁷ flood situation (4.03 hrs.);¹⁸⁸ disinvestment in PSUs (three days - 4.00 hrs.);¹⁸⁹ funds for PSUs (4.51 hrs.);¹⁹⁰ system of counter guarantees and other assurances given by the Government in the context of foreign investment in Power Sector (4.52 hrs.);¹⁹¹ situation arising out of the air-dropping of lethal weapons in Purulia posing a threat to National Security (4.05 hrs.);¹⁹² increasing insurgency in the North-Eastern States (5 hrs.);¹⁹³ diversion of funds to the tune of Rs. 45000 crores to the Personal Ledger Account by the West Bengal Government (4.30 hrs.);¹⁹⁴ poor performance and mismanagement of Air India (4.14 hrs.);¹⁹⁵ internal security problem with reference to the State of Jammu & Kashmir (4.13 hrs.);¹⁹⁶ the sale of BALCO at an abnormally low price (6.47 hrs.);¹⁹⁷ extreme volatility in the stock markets (4.35 hrs.);¹⁹⁸ policy of disinvestment in PSUs (4.51 hrs.);¹⁹⁹ circulars of UGC and the NCERT curriculum framework in the context of national policy on education (5.23 hrs.);²⁰⁰ storming of the disputed site at Ayodhya by VHP thereby flouting the Supreme Court directives (3.26 hrs.)²⁰¹; situation arising

out of growing labour unrest (3.28 hrs.)²⁰²; situation arising out of disputes over the sharing of inter-State river waters of Cauvery and Krishna Rivers (2.59 hrs.)²⁰³; implementation of Conditional Access System and criteria for uplinking for foreign channels (4.00 hrs.)²⁰⁴; exorbitant rise in the prices of petroleum products (3.29 hrs.)²⁰⁵; loss of human lives, properties and business in Mumbai and other parts of Maharashtra due to the unprecedented rains (4.09 hrs.)²⁰⁶; and progress of relief to the victims of 1984 riots (4.27 hrs.)²⁰⁷.

Conversion of Calling Attention into discussion

On many occasions, in view of the importance of the subject and consensus or demand in the House, a calling attention has been converted into full-fledged discussion in the form of motion²⁰⁸ or short duration discussion,²⁰⁹ after the concerned Minister responded to the calling attention. Such discussion has taken place the same day on which the calling attention was raised or on the next or subsequent day.

The Minister of Home Affairs stated in response to a calling attention regarding IB Report on use of foreign funds in elections that the Report had been received recently and was being examined carefully and that Government would take time to formulate the conclusions thereon. The Chairman did not permit anything more on that statement and informed the House that there would be a discussion on that at 4.00 p.m. that day itself. The discussion was initiated by the same member who had raised the calling attention.²¹⁰

A member called the attention to the disclosures made by a former CIA man about the activities of the CIA in this country and the Minister made a statement in regard thereto. During the course of clarifications, a member suggested that the matter should be fully discussed in the House. The Chairman agreed and the calling attention was not proceeded with further.²¹¹ The matter was accordingly discussed on a motion moved by a member.²¹²

In the midst of a calling attention regarding forcible entry of policemen into West Bengal Legislative Assembly, some members suggested that the matter called for a full debate. This was agreed to and the calling attention was not proceeded further. A short duration discussion was held the next day.²¹³

The Minister made a statement in response to a calling attention regarding allegations of use of money power in the biennial elections to the Rajya Sabha and its implications on the working and preservation of parliamentary democracy. On a suggestion made by some members, the Chairman agreed to allow a discussion on the subject. Before the House adjourned *sine die*, on 4 April 1970, the Vice-Chairman announced that the discussion would be held in next session (72nd). A short duration discussion was however held on 28 July 1970, during the 73rd Session.²¹⁴

A calling attention regarding the influx of refugees was admitted for 27 July 1970 and the concerned Minister made a statement in response thereto. There was a demand that the matter should be discussed fully. The Chairman agreed to allow a discussion on the subject immediately after laying of the papers on the same day. The member who had earlier called the attention moved a motion to take into consideration the influx of refugees. The motion, after discussion, was adopted by the House in an amended form.²¹⁵

Before the concerned member was called to raise the calling attention regarding heavy loss of life and property in Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry due to floods, the Chairman informed that on a suggestion of a number of members he agreed to expand the scope of the calling attention to include the drought situation in certain parts of the country so that the calling attention would deal with not only floods in Tamil Nadu but also cover both the drought and the flood situations. The member concerned, therefore, called the attention accordingly. Thereafter, the Chairman also announced that since the scope was widened, it should be taken up not as a calling attention but as a short duration discussion. After the Minister read out the statement, the Deputy Chairman stated that since it was a short duration discussion, names would be called party-wise with the exception of the member who called the attention would initiate the discussion as well. The calling attention thereafter proceeded as a short duration discussion.²¹⁶

On an occasion, a calling attention notice on price situation was admitted and listed in the list of business. However, in the revised list of business the subject was listed under short duration discussion. The calling attention was in the names of some members; the short duration discussion was in the names of some other members.²¹⁷

The Minister of Home Affairs made a statement on 27 April 1970, in response to a calling attention regarding lathi-charge and tear-gas by police on SSP demonstrators in New Delhi on 6 April 1970. On 28 April 1970, a member moved a motion to take the statement of the Home Minister into consideration. The motion was adopted in the following form:

That the statement made by the Home Minister in the Rajya Sabha on 27 April 1970, be taken into consideration, and having considered the same, this House views with grave concern the happenings of 6 April 1970, in connection with the SSP demonstration in and around Patel Chowk in New Delhi.²¹⁸

Sometimes without formally converting a calling attention into a short duration discussion the Chair may, sensing the desire of members, permit more members to speak.²¹⁹

Calling Attention on a *sub judice* matter

A point of order was raised regarding a calling attention on Government's decision to hold mid-term poll in Kerala, on the ground that the subject was pending before the High Court. The Chairman ruled:

A calling attention is not a motion. It does not involve discussion. Those who are calling the attention of the Government want to know from Government what are the facts and what is the position of the Government...No discussion is involved. In a calling attention only questions are put for clarification from Government.²²⁰

On another occasion, in regard to the admission of a calling attention regarding decision of the Medical Council of India to hold an All-India Entrance Examination, the Minister pointed out at the time of making the statement in response to the calling attention that the matter was *sub judice*, she had already informed the Secretariat accordingly and did not know why it was admitted. However, since the calling attention was admitted the Minister had to make the statement. But in reply to clarifications, which went on for an hour or so, the Minister merely stated, "I am not going to say anything beyond my statement...because the matter is *sub judice*. I will request the honourable members not to insist on it."²²¹

Important subjects raised through Calling Attention

Since last more than five decades, the calling attention procedure has been in the Rajya Sabha Rules. A number of subjects have been raised in the House through this device. Some of the constitutional, election, judicial matters and other miscellaneous subjects so raised in the House are listed below:

(a) *Constitutional matters*

Detention of a number of persons elected to Kerala Legislative Assembly in the mid-term elections and its effect on the normal constitutional process taking its course in the formation of a Government in that State;²²² constitutional implications of the action of the Governor of Rajasthan ordering removal of certain members of Rajasthan Assembly at the time of his Address to the Assembly on 26 February 1966;²²³ refusal of Governor of Rajasthan to invite non-Congress parties to form a Government in that State and imposition of President's Rule in Rajasthan;²²⁴ constitutional crisis in Madhya Pradesh due to sudden prorogation of the State Vidhan Sabha by the Governor on 20 July 1967;²²⁵ constitutional crisis in West Bengal;²²⁶ constitutional crisis in Punjab due to adjournment of the State Assembly by the Speaker for two months with the budget still pending there;²²⁷ constitutional implications of the Centre's attitude in regard to the demand for the recall of the Governor of West Bengal;²²⁸ refusal to administer the

oath/affirmation to some members of UP Legislative Assembly in Urdu language;²²⁹ constitutional crisis in Madhya Pradesh;²³⁰ forcible entry of policemen in West Bengal Legislative Assembly while it was in session on 31 July 1969;²³¹ constitutional crisis in Tamil Nadu;²³² constitutional crisis due to adjournment of the Nagaland Legislative Assembly *sine die* without passing the Budget;²³³ dissolution of J&K Assembly on the advice of the Chief Minister of that State;²³⁴ constitutional crisis in Assam due to prorogation of the Assam Legislative Assembly and promulgation of an Ordinance by the Governor for appropriation of money from the Consolidated Fund of the State;²³⁵ promulgation and repromulgation of Ordinances in States;²³⁶ resolution passed by the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly for abolition of the Legislative Council of that State;²³⁷ delay in assenting to Bills passed by State Legislatures and reserved by Governors for the consideration of the President;²³⁸ continued suspended animation of J&K Legislative Assembly;²³⁹ and permission given by the Government of India to the Government of Andhra Pradesh for introduction of Andhra Pradesh Special Powers (Press) Bill.²⁴⁰

(b) *Election matters*

Postponement of a bye-election in Nohar Assembly Constituency of Rajasthan;²⁴¹ revision of the electoral rolls of Basti Julahan Ward in the Sadar Parliamentary Constituency of Delhi for a bye-election to the Delhi Municipal Corporation;²⁴² decision to hold mid-term poll in Kerala;²⁴³ result of the enquiry conducted by the Deputy Chief Election Commissioner on the surplus ballot papers found in Chandigarh;²⁴⁴ incidents of violence and preventing voters from casting their votes during elections in some States;²⁴⁵ inadequacies in the electoral law in not providing a specific period for completion of a bye-election to Parliament;²⁴⁶ and delay in holding election to Delhi Metropolitan Council and bye-election in Garhwal Parliamentary Constituency.²⁴⁷

(c) *Judicial matters*

Supreme Court observations in its judgement in the case of *G. Sadanandan v. State of Kerala and Others* (Writ Petition No. 136 of 1965) regarding continuous use of DIR;²⁴⁸ reported resignation of a Judge of the Calcutta High Court on grounds of status, prestige, emoluments and various service conditions undermining the dignity of the judiciary²⁴⁹ Supreme Court judgement in the matter of the validity of the Punjab Appropriation Acts with particular reference to the implications thereof on the powers of the Legislature and the presiding officer;²⁵⁰ stabbing of Mr. Justice A.N. Grover of the Supreme Court in Chief Justice's room on 13 March 1968, while the Court was in session;²⁵¹ Supreme Court decision on the Writ Petitions challenging the Presidential Order derecognising the Rulers;²⁵² Supreme Court judgement on the Mulki Rules;²⁵³ arbitrary transfer of Chief Justice of the Allahabad High Court to the Karnataka High Court;²⁵⁴ proposed mass casual leave by Additional and District Sessions Judges and their protest march to the

Parliament House;²⁵⁵ prosecution of a BHEL manager on the alleged charge of giving information to Members of Parliament regarding BHEL-SIEMENS Agreement;²⁵⁶ resignation of Justice Srivastava of the Allahabad High Court due to alleged harassment by Government agencies;²⁵⁷ and Supreme Court decision setting aside the election of a candidate on the ground of use of electronic machine for voting in some booths in Parur Assembly Constituency in Kerala, as having no legal sanction.²⁵⁸

(d) *Miscellaneous matters*

Tapping of telephone of Chief Minister of Punjab;²⁵⁹ statement made by a former editor of a newspaper at Poona regarding Nathuram Godse's plan to assassinate Mahatma Gandhi;²⁶⁰ progress of investigation into Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon's assassination;²⁶¹ purchase of the original manuscript. of Gitanjali by an American citizen;²⁶² Z.A. Bhutto's statement before the Custodian-General of Evacuee Property in India that he was an Indian national;²⁶³ assurance of the Leader of the House in the Rajya Sabha on 19 May 1966, regarding observations contained in the 50th Report of the PAC and Government's decision to post the concerned officer as India's Ambassador at Brussels;²⁶⁴ missing of important documents relating to the Kutch dispute;²⁶⁵ unwillingness of the Union Home Ministry to furnish to Government of Orissa an official copy of the CBI Report and Cabinet sub-committee's findings on certain allegations against former Chief Minister;²⁶⁶ report in New York Times about CBI's conclusion that USA had spent vast sums of money to influence last general election;²⁶⁷ Prime Minister's message of congratulations to the President of Pakistan on the completion of the Mangla Dam;²⁶⁸ burning of the national flag and the Constitution by anti-Hindi demonstrators in certain parts of Tamil Nadu;²⁶⁹ refusal of US Embassy, New Delhi to receive the summons of a Delhi Magistrate;²⁷⁰ insulting behaviour of the Secretary, Ministry of Law (Department of Legal Affairs) towards the Deputy Minister of Law, Shri Mohd. Yunus Saleem;²⁷¹ formation of a Communist Party of India on Mao's ideas;²⁷² statement of Chief Minister of Kerala regarding undermining the Constitution from within;²⁷³ decision to shift location of Gandhiji's statue from India Gate;²⁷⁴ suggestion of Gen. K.M. Cariappa for scrapping the Constitution, imposition of President's Rule in the country and administration by the army;²⁷⁵ request of the Tamil Nadu Government for a separate State Flag;²⁷⁶ Pakistani spy-ring operating in West Bengal and alleged involvement of some ex-Ministers of Government of West Bengal and a Member of Parliament from that State therein;²⁷⁷ increase in postal rates on the eve of Parliament session;²⁷⁸ reported removal of a letter written by the President of the BLD from the files of the Election Commission about party's election symbol;²⁷⁹ exchange of correspondence between the Prime Minister and former Home Minister;²⁸⁰ violent incident in Calcutta in which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan's car was attacked and a Member of Parliament and his colleague sustained injuries;²⁸¹ detention in prisons of a large number of political prisoners under MISA, DIR, etc.;²⁸² victimisation of journalists by newspaper managements;²⁸³ installation of a puppet Black Government in Zimbabwe;²⁸⁴ hunger strike by an MP in support of

demand to curb oppression of *Harijans*;²⁸⁵ reported disclosures of certain confidential correspondence between the former President, Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy and the former Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai;²⁸⁶ follow-up action on the JPC Report on securities scam;²⁸⁷ need of having a national consensus for India's Nuclear Policy with reference to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty;²⁸⁸ the situation arising out of the air-dropping of lethal weapons in Purulia posing a threat to the National Security;²⁸⁹ situation arising out of the disinvestment of profit-making Central Public Sector Units due to lack of financial support and timely decisions;²⁹⁰ Securities Scam in Co-operative Banks and failure of the Central Government Regulations and remedial measures taken by Government with regard thereto;²⁹¹ issues arising out of the decision of the VSNL Board to invest Rs. 1200 crores in TATA Tele Services Ltd.;²⁹² suicides committed by cotton growers in Maharashtra and other parts of the country;²⁹³ problems of sugarcane growers;²⁹⁴ crisis in the plantation sector, namely, tea, coffee, rubber, etc. and the steps taken by the Government in this regard;²⁹⁵ closing down of fertilizer plants of the Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation and the Fertilizer Corporation of India particularly in the eastern region of the country;²⁹⁶ poisonous effect on wheat, rice, sugar and other food items on being packaged in plastic bags;²⁹⁷ situation arising out of growing labour unrest caused by loss of jobs, violation of labour laws, closure of units, privatisation of PSUs, etc.;²⁹⁸ faulty public distribution system;²⁹⁹ Foreign Direct Investment in Electronic Media;³⁰⁰ situation arising out of disputes over the sharing of inter-state river waters of Cauvery and Krishna rivers and action taken by Government with regard thereto;³⁰¹ implementation of Conditional Access System and criteria for uplinking for foreign channels;³⁰² plight of tea garden workers due to sickness and closure of a large number of tea gardens leading to starvation deaths;³⁰³ death of children recently due to malnutrition and starvation in Maharashtra;³⁰⁴ incidents of suicide by farmers in various parts of the country and remedial measures taken by Government with regard thereto;³⁰⁵ irregularities in disinvestment of Centaur Hotel, Mumbai and violation of shareholders agreement in post disinvestment period;³⁰⁶ climate change;³⁰⁷ relief to victims of 1984 riots;³⁰⁸ role of print and electronic media including the paid news;³⁰⁹ irregularities in the functioning of the Medical Council of India (MCI);³¹⁰ rotting of food grains due to lack of storage facilities;³¹¹ utilisation of agricultural land for non-agricultural purpose;³¹² frequent accidents in railways and rail safety;³¹³ discrimination and racial profiling faced by students from north-eastern States;³¹⁴ removal of uterus of females of BPL in Bihar and various parts of the country under NRHM programmes;³¹⁵ all India strike by workers of organised and unorganised sector;³¹⁶ situation arising out of repeated attacks on Indian fishermen by Sri Lankan Navy;³¹⁷ pollution on sea beaches in Goa caused by tar balls formed due to discharge from sea vessels;³¹⁸ plight of stranded workers from India in Iraq;³¹⁹ move by the Government to introduce changes in the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) by reducing the wage component of the fund allocation and restricting the areas of work;³²⁰ etc.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Old Rule 156.
2. Summary of the Proceedings of the meeting of the Committee on Rules, 3.6.1952 and 9.7.1952; F. No. CS/3/52-L.
3. Brochure entitled *Questions and Adjournment Motions in Second Chambers*, June 1952.
4. C.S. Deb., 16.5.1952, c. 44-45.
5. Later renumbered as Rule 175.
6. May, p. 475.
7. Bn. (II), 1.7.1964.
8. R. 180; see also R.S. Deb., 26.11.2014, pp. 319-36; Bn. (II), 26.11.2014.
9. Bn. (II), 11.8.1964; see also R.S. Deb., 12.8.1968, c. 28-74; and 14.8.1968, c. 3401-02.
10. R.S. Deb., 23.5.1979, c. 1-3; Bn. (II), 23.5.1979 and 6.7.1979.
11. See for instance, Bn. (II), 3.2.1994.
12. R.S. Deb., 19.8.1968, c. 3477-79.
13. 2 Rpt., COR, p. 12, 21, 27.
14. R.S. Deb., 23.5.1979, c. 1-3; and Bn. (II), 23.5.1979.
15. 2 Rpt., COR, p. 3.
16. R.S. Deb., 24.12.1981, c. 502.
17. *Ibid.*, 15.12.1981, c. 162-68.
18. 2 Rpt., COR.
19. R. 180(1), *Proviso*.
20. 2 Rpt., COR. p. 21.
21. R.S. Deb., 6.5.1986, c. 184.
22. *Ibid.*, 13.12.1985, c. 200-02.
23. *Ibid.*, 14.8.1968, c. 3387-3402; 19.8.1968, c. 3470-79; See also R.S. Deb., 3.5.1978, c. 131-38.
24. *Ibid.*, 6.5.1986, c. 183-85.
25. Bn. (II), 4.12.1971.
26. R.S. Deb., 21.7.1975, c. 33-44.
27. *Ibid.*, 3.11.1976, c. 38-49.
28. Bn. (II), 20.9.1976.
29. *Ibid.*, 27.10.1976.
30. R.S. Deb., 26.3.1985, c. 184-86.
31. *Ibid.*, 19.8.1968, c. 3477-79.
32. *Ibid.*, 4.8.1978, c. 106.
33. *Ibid.*, 15.3.1989, c. 1-4; and 16.3.1989, c. 1-8.
34. *Ibid.*, 19.6.1967, c. 4659-62.
35. *Ibid.*, 21.3.1975, c. 116-18.
36. *Ibid.*, 5.8.1982, c. 264.
37. *Ibid.*, 27.3.1981, c. 153-54; see also 25.11.1981, c. 208-56.
38. *Ibid.*, 11.3.1981, c. 294-96; For instance when two or more related subjects were combined in a Calling Attention, see Bn. (I), 1.12.1964, 5.5.1966, 3.8.1966, 11.8.1966, 7.4.1967, 11.4.1967, 22.6.1967, 26.7.1967 and 19.8.1968.
39. *Ibid.*, 28.7.1978, c. 149-54.
40. *Ibid.*, 25.11.1981, c. 208-56.
41. *Ibid.*, 11.12.1981, c. 203-11.
42. LoB, 2.12.1983; R.S. Deb., 5.12.1983, c. 256-301.
43. *Ibid.*, 21.6.1971.
44. *Ibid.*, 20.7.1978.
45. *Ibid.*, 11.8.1978.
46. *Ibid.*, 6.3.1981.
47. *Ibid.*, 17.3.1981.

48. LoB, 20.8.1981.
49. *Ibid.*, 27.4.1984.
50. *Ibid.*, 4.8.1986.
51. *Ibid.*, 27.8.1987.
52. *Ibid.*, 13.11.1987.
53. *Ibid.*, 2.12.1988.
54. *Ibid.*, 2.1.1991.
55. *Ibid.*, 18.8.1993.
56. 2 Rpt., COR, p. 17, 22 and 26.
57. BAC mts., 13.10.1982; and Bn. (II), 14.10.1982.
58. R.S. Deb., 15.12.1981, c. 162-68.
59. *Ibid.*, 3.4.1970, c. 4-15.
60. R. 180(3).
61. R. 180(4).
62. Bn. (I), 25.9.1964, 1.12.1964, 31.3.1965, 4.5.1965, 14.5.1965, 10.12.1965, 11.12.1965, 25.2.1966, 21.3.1966, 22.3.1966, 23.3.1966, 25.3.1966, 16.5.1966, 17.5.1966, 18.5.1966, 7.9.1966, 29.11.1966, 11.4.1967, 26.7.1967, 7.8.1967, 30.11.1967 and 13.5.1968.
63. *Ibid.*, 10.3.1965, 11.11.1965, 18.11.1965, 23.3.1966 and 26.8.1966.
64. *Ibid.*, 13.5.1965, 17.8.1966, 23.8.1966, 24.8.1966, 5.4.1967, 6.4.1967, 23.11.1967, 19.3.1968, 8.5.1968, 1.9.1981, 13.8.1982, 5.11.1982 and 12.5.1989.
65. *Ibid.*, 7.8.1967.
66. *Ibid.*, 30.11.1967.
67. *Ibid.*, 2.9.1966 and 5.9.1966.
68. 1 Rpt., COR presented to the House on 10.4.1972.
69. R.S. Deb., 1.6.1972.
70. Bn. (II), 1.7.1972.
71. 1 Rpt., COR, p. 7.
72. R.S. Deb., 3.9.1991, c. 351-52.
73. *Ibid.*, 4.9.1991, c. 185-202.
74. BAC mts., 11.5.1992.
75. R.S. Deb., 27.7.1993.
76. *Ibid.*, 16.9.1991, c. 14-15.
77. R. 180(5); see also R.S. Deb., 26.11.2014, pp. 319-36; Bn. (II), 26.11.2014.
78. R.S. Deb., 22.4.1981, c. 199-201.
79. *Ibid.*, 3.12.1981, c. 192-94.
80. *Ibid.*, 15.12.1964, 23.12.1964 and 9.3.1970.
81. Bn. (I), 9.8.1971, 6.3.1973, 21.3.1973, 15.11.1974, 20.2.1975, 13.6.1977, 15.6.1977, 21.6.1977, 20.7.1977, 29.7.1977, 5.12.1977, 6.12.1977, 22.3.1978, 22.4.1978, 26.4.1978, 19.7.1978, 21.2.1979, 13.3.1979 and 2.9.1981.
82. *Ibid.*, 12.8.1966.
83. *Ibid.*, 17.8.1966, 23.8.1966, 27.4.1970, 29.7.1971, 19.11.1973, 25.4.1978 and 24.8.1978.
84. R.S. Deb., 19.11.1970, c. 131; 22.4.1981, c. 191-201; 15.3.1982, c. 189; 25.3.1982, c. 175-77; 9.7.1982, c. 186-99; and 25.2.1983, c. 161.
85. *Ibid.*, 8.11.1966, c. 315-16 and 410-34.
86. *Ibid.*, 31.8.1981, c. 185; and 1.9.1981, c. 11-12, 175.
87. *Ibid.*, 3.12.1981, c. 192.
88. *Ibid.*, 5.3.1982, c. 148-49.
89. *Ibid.*, 28.2.1983, c. 262-74.
90. *Ibid.*, 17.8.1983, c. 170.
91. *Ibid.*, 4.3.1986, c. 527.
92. *Ibid.*, 25.11.1986, c. 185.
93. *Ibid.*, 25.7.1968, c. 687-88.
94. *Ibid.*, 15.12.1980, c. 218-19.
95. *Ibid.*, 25.11.1981, c. 247.

96. R.S. Deb., 19.7.1989, c. 275-90.
97. *Ibid.*, 24.4.1986, c. 171.
98. *Ibid.*, 18.5.1973, c. 13.
99. *Ibid.*, 8.3.1982, c. 209.
100. *Ibid.*, 5.12.1985, c. 176.
101. *Ibid.*, 21.11.1978, c. 167-73.
102. *Ibid.*, 7.8.1985, c. 147.
103. *Ibid.*, 3.12.1968, c. 2407-16; and 5.12.1968, c. 2843-59.
104. *Ibid.*, 28.7.1978, c. 149-54.
105. *Ibid.*, 25.11.1981, c. 208-56; see also R.S. Deb., 11.12.1981, c. 203-11.
106. *Ibid.*, 23.11.1967, c. 944; and 24.11.1967, c. 1177-86.
107. *Ibid.*, 7.8.1968, c. 2427-29; and 13.8.1968, c. 3060-98.
108. *Ibid.*, 19.11.1970, c. 131, 192 and 210.
109. *Ibid.*, 30.11.1970, c. 85-100.
110. *Ibid.*, 6.8.1993, c. 271.
111. *Ibid.*, 10.8.1993, c. 559-76; and 12.8.1993, c. 198 and 238.
112. Bn. (I), 30.8.2012.
113. *Ibid.*, 6.9.2012.
114. R.S. Deb., 18.3.1980, c. 150-60; 19.3.1980, c. 162-206; and LoB, 19.3.1980.
115. *Ibid.*, 23.11.1981, c. 300-08; 24.11.1981, c. 185; and LoB, 24.11.1981.
116. *Ibid.*, 4.11.1982, c. 413-20; 5.11.1982, c. 303-06; and LoB, 5.11.1982.
117. *Ibid.*, 21.2.1983, c. 291-93; 22.2.1983, c. 202; and LoB, 22.2.1983.
118. *Ibid.*, 13.3.1968 and 14.3.1968.
119. *Ibid.*, 10.5.1968 and 11.5.1968.
120. *Ibid.*, 6.3.1969 and 7.3.1969.
121. *Ibid.*, 5.3.1982, c. 172-74; and 8.3.1982, c. 202.
122. *Ibid.*, 25.2.1966, c. 1395-96.
123. *Ibid.*, 20.6.1967, c. 4889-91, 4897-4900; and 21.6.1967, c. 5127, etc.
124. *Ibid.*, 10.3.1981, c. 184-94.
125. *Ibid.*, 1.9.1981, c. 11-12, 175, 269-72; and 2.9.1981, c. 25, 248-396.
126. *Ibid.*, 30.11.1967, c. 1941; and Bn. (I), 3.12.1973 (f.n.).
127. *Ibid.*, 9.3.1978, c. 184.
128. *Ibid.*, 6.12.1974, c. 177-79.
129. *Ibid.*, 14.12.1981, c. 176-81.
130. *Ibid.*, 19.7.1989, c. 275-90.
131. R. 180(2).
132. Bn. (II), 20.4.1979 and 6.7.1979.
133. R.S. Deb., 3.7.1980, c. 4-5; and Bn. (II), 3.7.1980.
134. Bn. (II), 3.7.1980; see also R.S. Deb., 14.8.1971, c. 10-12.
135. BAC mts., 13.10.1982 and Bn. (II), 14.10.1982.
136. R.S. Deb., 15.10.1982, c. 177-88; 16.10.1982, c. 67-69; and 20.10.1982, c. 168-70.
137. BAC mts., 17.7.1991; See also BAC mts., 12.8.1993.
138. R.S. Deb., 14.6.1967, c. 3855.
139. *Ibid.*, 26.7.1967, c. 587.
140. *Ibid.*, 17.8.1967, c. 4553.
141. 2 Rpt., COR, p. 17, 22 and 26.
142. R.S. Deb., 7.4.1967, c. 2803-10; 8.4.1967, c. 2904-24; 24.11.1967, c. 1078; 7.8.1968, c. 2427-29; 13.8.1968, c. 3060; 3.12.1968, c. 2407-16; 5.12.1968, c. 2843 etc.; 6.5.1969, c. 1184-96; Bn. (I), 1.3.1979 (f.n.) and 2.3.1979; R.S. Deb., 4.11.1982, c. 335-67; 5.11.1982, c. 430; 18.11.1983, c. 242-69, 337-38; and 21.11.1983, c. 306-66.
143. Bn. (II), 20.4.1979.
144. *Ibid.*, 3.7.1980.
145. R.S. Deb., 20.2.1979, c. 183-86.
146. *Ibid.*, 21.11.1978, c. 167-69.

147. R.S. Deb., 24.12.1980, c. 17-18.
148. *Ibid.*, 15.9.1981, c. 256-57.
149. *Ibid.*, 20.10.1982, c. 167.
150. *Ibid.*, 22.2.1983; 1.3.1983; 3.3.1983; 23.3.1983; 3.5.1983; 5.5.1983; 10.5.1983; 26.7.1983; 28.7.1983; 29.7.1983; 2.8.1983; 5.8.1983; 8.8.1983; 9.8.1983; 12.8.1983 and 7.8.1983.
151. *Ibid.*, 21.3.1983, c. 251.
152. *Ibid.*, 15.3.1983, c. 242-92; and 18.3.1983, c. 242-71.
153. *Ibid.*, 21.12.1983, c. 201-24.
154. *Ibid.*, 25.11.1986, c. 268-334; and 26.11.1986, c. 164-81.
155. *Ibid.*, 15.7.1991, c. 233.
156. *Ibid.*, 6.3.1984, c. 190-216; and 26.4.1984, c. 132-66.
157. *Ibid.*, 3.4.1967, c. 1927-29.
158. *Ibid.*, 18.8.1967, c. 4838.
159. *Ibid.*, 28.8.1970, c. 171.
160. *Ibid.*, 3.9.1970, c. 16-18.
161. *Ibid.*, 4.9.1970, c. 29-30.
162. *Ibid.*, 11.11.1970, c. 110.
163. *Ibid.*, 30.7.1971, c. 178-84 and 204-55.
164. Bn. (II), 20.4.1979.
165. Bn. (I), 1.5.1969 and 6.5.1969; 1.3.1979 and 2.3.1979; 24.4.1979 and 25.4.1979; 1.9.1981 and 2.9.1981; 4.11.1982 and 5.11.1982; 18.11.1983 and 21.11.1983; 4.11.1986 and 5.11.1986; 20.11.1987 and 24.11.1987; 27.8.1990 and 28.8.1990; 2.1.1991, 3.1.1991 and 4.1.1991; 6.8.1993, 10.8.1993 and 12.8.1993.
166. *Ibid.*, 23.3.1978.
167. *Ibid.*, 24.4.1979 and 25.4.1979.
168. *Ibid.*, 24.1.1980.
169. *Ibid.*, 6.5.1981.
170. *Ibid.*, 1.9.1981 and 2.9.1981.
171. *Ibid.*, 15.9.1981.
172. *Ibid.*, 25.11.1981.
173. *Ibid.*, 11.10.1982.
174. *Ibid.*, 12.10.1982.
175. *Ibid.*, 26.7.1984.
176. *Ibid.*, 22.7.1986.
177. *Ibid.*, 13.11.1986.
178. *Ibid.*, 15.4.1987.
179. *Ibid.*, 28.4.1987.
180. *Ibid.*, 25.8.1987.
181. *Ibid.*, 2.8.1989.
182. *Ibid.*, 2.1.1991, 3.1.1991 and 4.1.1991.
183. *Ibid.*, 4.12.1991.
184. *Ibid.*, 18.12.1991.
185. *Ibid.*, 12.5.1992.
186. *Ibid.*, 15.3.1993.
187. *Ibid.*, 12.5.1993.
188. *Ibid.*, 26.7.1993.
189. *Ibid.*, 6.8.1993, 10.8.1993 and 12.8.1993.
190. *Ibid.*, 25.8.1994.
191. *Ibid.*, 23.8.1994.
192. *Ibid.*, 18.3.1996.
193. *Ibid.*, 14.5.1997.
194. *Ibid.*, 6.8.1997.
195. *Ibid.*, 2.5.2000.
196. *Ibid.*, 10.5.2000.

197. Bn. (I), 27.2.2001.
198. *Ibid.*, 13.3.2001.
199. *Ibid.*, 24.8.2001.
200. *Ibid.*, 29.8.2001.
201. *Ibid.*, 21.11.2001.
202. *Ibid.*, 26.2.2003.
203. *Ibid.*, 30.7.2003.
204. *Ibid.*, 6.8.2003.
205. *Ibid.*, 8.12.2004.
206. *Ibid.*, 2.8.2005 and 3.8.2005.
207. *Ibid.*, 14.12.2009.
208. R.S. Deb., 22.7.1968, c. 101-04; and 23.7.1968, c. 310-412.
209. *Ibid.*, 24.7.1967, c. 119, 148; 29.2.1968, c. 2539-45, 2592, etc.; 4.8.1969, c. 2226-57; 5.8.1969, 2469-549; 1.12.1969, c. 2166-68; and 27.7.1977, c. 127-30.
210. *Ibid.*, 19.6.1967, c. 4659-63, 4740, etc.
211. *Ibid.*, 24.11.1967, c. 1078-97.
212. *Ibid.*, 12.12.1967, c. 3591-3718; and 13.12.1967, c. 3827-3909.
213. *Ibid.*, 4.8.1969, c. 2226-57; 5.8.1969, c. 2469-2549 and 2553-58.
214. *Ibid.*, 4.4.1970, c. 3-28, 202; 19.5.1970, c. 248-64; and 28.7.1970, c. 170-250.
215. *Ibid.*, 27.7.1970, c. 131-41, 152, etc.
216. *Ibid.*, 18.11.1985, c. 359-474.
217. LoB and revised LoB for 7.8.1990 and 8.8.1990.
218. R.S. Deb., 27.4.1970, c. 118-80; and 28.4.1970, c. 119-38.
219. *Ibid.*, 27.7.1983, c. 214-59; and 2.1.1991, c. 761-62.
220. *Ibid.*, 31.7.1970, c. 126.
221. *Ibid.*, 12.8.1985, c. 242-75.
222. Bn. (I), 10.3.1965.
223. *Ibid.*, 28.3.1966.
224. *Ibid.*, 20.3.1967.
225. *Ibid.*, 24.7.1967.
226. *Ibid.*, 16.2.1968.
227. *Ibid.*, 11.3.1968.
228. *Ibid.*, 7.3.1969.
229. *Ibid.*, 18.3.1969.
230. *Ibid.*, 21.3.1969.
231. *Ibid.*, 4.8.1969.
232. *Ibid.*, 5.12.1972.
233. *Ibid.*, 22.3.1975.
234. *Ibid.*, 30.3.1977.
235. *Ibid.*, 27.4.1981.
236. *Ibid.*, 22.8.1983.
237. *Ibid.*, 14.3.1984.
238. *Ibid.*, 25.11.1985.
239. *Ibid.*, 12.5.1986.
240. *Ibid.*, 22.8.1968.
241. *Ibid.*, 14.5.1965.
242. *Ibid.*, 9.5.1969.
243. *Ibid.*, 31.7.1970.
244. *Ibid.*, 31.3.1971.
245. *Ibid.*, 21.6.1977.
246. *Ibid.*, 25.11.1981.
247. *Ibid.*, 5.3.1982.
248. *Ibid.*, 25.2.1966.
249. *Ibid.*, 10.5.1968.

-
250. Bn. (I), 7.8.1968.
 251. *Ibid.*, 14.3.1968.
 252. *Ibid.*, 16.12.1970.
 253. *Ibid.*, 23.11.1972.
 254. *Ibid.*, 13.3.1978.
 255. *Ibid.*, 13.3.1979.
 256. *Ibid.*, 26.3.1980.
 257. *Ibid.*, 30.7.1980.
 258. *Ibid.*, 9.3.1984.
 259. *Ibid.*, 28.9.1964.
 260. *Ibid.*, 24.11.1964.
 261. *Ibid.*, 11.3.1965.
 262. *Ibid.*, 12.3.1965.
 263. *Ibid.*, 19.11.1965.
 264. *Ibid.*, 19.5.1966.
 265. *Ibid.*, 24.8.1966.
 266. *Ibid.*, 8.6.1967.
 267. *Ibid.*, 19.6.1967.
 268. *Ibid.*, 23.11.1967.
 269. *Ibid.*, 27.2.1968.
 270. *Ibid.*, 31.3.1969.
 271. *Ibid.*, 1.5.1969 and 6.5.1969.
 272. *Ibid.*, 7.5.1969.
 273. *Ibid.*, 22.7.1969.
 274. *Ibid.*, 3.12.1969.
 275. *Ibid.*, 12.3.1970.
 276. *Ibid.*, 25.8.1970.
 277. *Ibid.*, 31.5.1971.
 278. *Ibid.*, 9.3.1976.
 279. *Ibid.*, 24.6.1977.
 280. *Ibid.*, 19.7.1978.
 281. *Ibid.*, 28.4.1975.
 282. *Ibid.*, 6.4.1977.
 283. *Ibid.*, 17.6.1977.
 284. *Ibid.*, 20.3.1978.
 285. *Ibid.*, 20.7.1978.
 286. *Ibid.*, 25.8.1983.
 287. *Ibid.*, 10.5.1994.
 288. *Ibid.*, 17.5.1995.
 289. *Ibid.*, 8.3.1996.
 290. *Ibid.*, 19.12.1996.
 291. *Ibid.*, 16.5.2002.
 292. *Ibid.*, 1.8.2002.
 293. *Ibid.*, 27.11.2002.
 294. *Ibid.*, 2.12.2002.
 295. *Ibid.*, 9.12.2002.
 296. *Ibid.*, 12.12.2002.
 297. *Ibid.*, 13.12.2002.
 298. *Ibid.*, 26.2.2003.
 299. *Ibid.*, 30.4.2003.
 300. *Ibid.*, 9.5.2003.
 301. *Ibid.*, 30.7.2003.
 302. *Ibid.*, 6.8.2003.
 303. *Ibid.*, 19.12.2003.

304. Bn. (I), 9.7.2004.
305. *Ibid.*, 14.7.2004.
306. *Ibid.*, 18.8.2004.
307. *Ibid.*, 24.11.2009.
308. *Ibid.*, 14.12.2009.
309. *Ibid.*, 5.3.2010.
310. *Ibid.*, 4.5.2010.
311. *Ibid.*, 10.8.2010.
312. *Ibid.*, 15.3.2010.
313. *Ibid.*, 4.8.2010.
314. *Ibid.*, 4.5.2012.
315. *Ibid.*, 28.8.2012.
316. *Ibid.*, 15.3.2013.
317. *Ibid.*, 20.2.2014.
318. *Ibid.*, 8.7.2014.
319. *Ibid.*, 4.8.2014.
320. *Ibid.*, 27.11.2014.