Resolution regarding removal of Speaker from Office - Under Consideration

[illegible] : [illegible]

DR. MOHAMMAD JAWED (KISHANGANJ): Sir, I move the following Resolution:

?That this House, having taken into consideration the conduct of the Speaker of the House as regards disallowing the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition leaders to speak, making unwarranted allegations against women MPs belonging to the Opposition, suspending Opposition MPs for an entire session for raising issues of public concern and not rebuking ruling party members for making wholly objectionable and derogatory remarks against former PMs, feels he has ceased to maintain an impartial attitude necessary to command the confidence of all sections of the House; that in his partisan attitude he disregards the rights of Members of the House and makes pronouncements and gives rulings calculated to affect and undermine such rights; that he openly espouses the version of the ruling party on all controversial matters, that all these acts constitute a serious danger to the proper functioning of this House and ventilating effectively the felt concerns and grievances of the people, and therefore resolves that he be removed from his Office.?

SHRI K.C. VENUGOPAL (ALAPPUZHA): Sir, how much time is being allotted for this discussion?

[illegible]:

[illegible] 94 [illegible] 200, [illegible] 94 [illegible], [illegible] 200 [illegible] It deals with the ?Notice of resolution for removal of Speaker or Deputy Speaker?. It reads:

?(1) A member wishing to give notice of a resolution, under clause (c) of article 94 of the Constitution, for the removal of the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker shall do so in writing to the Secretary-General.

(2) On receipt of a notice under sub-rule (1) a motion for leave to move the resolution shall be entered in the list of business in the name of the member concerned, on a day fixed by the Speaker, provided that the day so fixed shall be any day after fourteen days from the date of the receipt of notice of the resolution.?

[illegible] 200 (1) [illegible] -

?In order that such a resolution may be admissible, it shall satisfy the following conditions, namely:-

(i) it shall be specific with respect to charges;

(ii) it shall be clearly and precisely expressed; and

(iii) it shall not contain arguments, inferences, ironical expressions, imputations or defamatory statements.?

[illegible] 10 [illegible]...

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible] 10 [illegible], 2026 [illegible] 10 [illegible], 2026 [illegible], [illegible]. [illegible] 119 [illegible] 2026 [illegible], [illegible] 2025 [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]

[illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible]

[illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] 1954, [illegible] 1966 [illegible] [illegible] 1987 [illegible]

[illegible]

? ([illegible])

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]? [redacted] 1954 [redacted]

? ([redacted])

SHRI K. C. VENUGOPAL: Sir, there is a point of order. *? (Interruptions)*

[redacted] : [redacted]...

? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]

SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH (MAVELIKKARA): ... This is very, very unfortunate. ? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

[illegible] : [illegible]

[illegible], [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] ([illegible]) : [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]-[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

? ([illegible])

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Nothing will go on record except the speech of Shri Gaurav Gogoi ji.

? (*Interruptions*) ?

[illegible] : [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] ? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible] [illegible] ? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]? [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible], [illegible]

? ([illegible])

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Nothing will go on record.

? (*Interruptions*) ?

[illegible] : [illegible]:

? [illegible], [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] : [illegible]

The Supreme Court of India in the case of Nabam Rebia versus Deputy Speaker said, ?The Speaker is expected to have a sense of elevated independence...?.

[illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible] ? ([illegible]) [illegible] ? ([illegible])

[illegible] It says, ?The Speaker is expected

to have a sense of elevated independence, impeccable objectivity, and irreproachable fairness and, above all, absolute impartiality?.

[redacted]

[redacted]? ([redacted])

[redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible] ?The Speaker or the Deputy Speaker not to preside while a resolution for his removal from office is under consideration.? The key word is, ?the Speaker cannot preside?. He might be present but he cannot preside.

[illegible]

?The Speaker or the Deputy Speaker not to preside while a resolution for his removal from office is under consideration.?

Sir, we are considering a resolution for the removal of the Speaker from his office. How has it been decided that the hon. Chairperson, Shri Jagdambika Pal will be sitting in the Chair? ? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: You have decided this.

? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GAURAV GOGOI: How has it been decided? ? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: The House has decided this.

? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI GAURAV GOGOI: How has it been decided? ? (*Interruptions*) The name has been chosen from the panel of Chairpersons. ? (*Interruptions*) How has it been decided? ? (*Interruptions*)

Sir, let the record state. We are registering our stronge protest that the House has no record that the Chairperson currently occupying the seat from the Panel of Chairpersons should be the one presiding. The House has no such record.

[illegible]

[illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible] Article 96 of the Constitution states:

?The Speaker or the Deputy Speaker not to preside while a resolution for his removal from office is under consideration.?

[illegible]

[illegible]; [illegible] : [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Suresh, you must read the provision.

? (Interruptions)

***m10**[illegible]

[illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]?

As per Article 95(2), the House should determine as to which person shall Act as Speaker. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] disallowing the Leader of the Opposition and other Opposition leaders to speak - [illegible] Motion of Thanks on the President?s Address [illegible]

[illegible] Motion of Thanks on the President?s Address, [illegible] ?? ([illegible])

[illegible] ? ([illegible])

***m11[illegible] :** [illegible]

? ([illegible])

***m12[illegible] :** [illegible] We are saying: ?The

Speaker of the House did not allow the Leader of the Opposition to speak.? I am merely substantiating our Resolution through examples. What happened then? The LoP was repeatedly interrupted while attempting to place a few critical issues mandatory to be known for the House and to the citizens of the country.

[illegible] ? ([illegible])

[illegible] - ? [illegible] ??

[illegible] ? ([illegible]) [illegible] ? ([illegible])

**[illegible] : [illegible] ? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible] ? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible] ? ([illegible])

***m14[redacted]** : [redacted]-[redacted]-[redacted] [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) This was not the only truth highlighted by the LoP. ? (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding.

[redacted], [redacted] ? ([redacted]) I am not yielding. ? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

***m15[redacted]; [redacted]** : [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted] - [redacted]

? ([redacted])

***m16[redacted]** : [redacted]

[redacted]

***m17[redacted]:** [redacted]

***m18[redacted]:** [redacted]

***m19[redacted]:** [redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted]

? ([redacted])

SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH: Sir, the same thing you have to tell the Treasury Benches also. ? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: I have already mentioned it.

? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted]

SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH: Why are you telling it to us only? ? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: The Parliamentary Affairs Minister has all the right to intervene at any moment.

? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH: Why do you not tell the Treasury Benches also? ? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted]

***m20[redacted]** [redacted] He questioned about the millions of pages released from the US Department of Justice regarding which the world is questioning. ? (*Interruptions*) The file contains name of a very famous businessman who is known to be very close to this ruling Government. ? (*Interruptions*) The file also contains an uncomfortable truth that a Minister has been named in this ongoing global investigation in other parts of the world. ? (*Interruptions*)

***m21[redacted] [redacted] :** [redacted], [redacted] if you go through Rule 202A, it only provides that: ?The discussion on the resolution shall be strictly confined to the charges preferred in the resolution?.

? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted] [redacted] : [redacted], you have to confine to them only.

? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted] : [redacted]

HON. CHAIRPERSON: I will request all the Members that they may speak only on the charges preferred. [redacted]

? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted] : [redacted]

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]? [redacted]

? ([redacted])

***m22SHRI GAURAV GOGOI:** Sir, I am reading out the Resolution. It says, ?That this House, having taken into consideration the conduct of the Speaker of the House regarding the disallowing of the Leader of the Opposition to speak?.? When? I am substantiating it now. This occurred during the Motion of Thanks on the President?s Address in the month of February, when the hon. Leader of the Opposition was not allowed to speak. I am substantiating this Resolution.

What was he saying at that time? At that point, the LoP spoke about the trade deals between the US and India. He raised a very simple question: what compelled India to act in haste and enter into a deal which is not even in our favour? He referred to the concessions India was giving in our agricultural market ? concessions the Indian Government was extending to the US Government, which are detrimental to the interests of our farmers. Certain crops had been listed in that context. Potatoes were listed. Potatoes are extremely important.

[illegible] ? (**[illegible]**)

***m23[illegible] :** [illegible] 50 [illegible] 30 [illegible] Even then, the LoP had been given sufficient time. [illegible]

? (**[illegible]**)

[illegible] : [illegible]?

? (**[illegible]**)

SHRI K. C. VENUGOPAL: Sir, they will give the reply. Why are you giving the reply? You are in the chair ? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted] : [redacted] But I am sitting here.

? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

[redacted] : [redacted]

? ([redacted])

*m24[redacted] : [redacted]? When the Leader of the Opposition attempted to bring critical matters to light, hon. Speaker asked him to authenticate the documents he was citing. With due respect to the Chair, the LoP did not refuse this request. He agreed. He said, ?I will authenticate them.? [redacted] Despite this compliance, the visible discomfort of the Treasury Benches repeatedly manifested as loud interruptions, effectively preventing the LoP from continuing his address. [redacted]?

13.00 hrs

[redacted]

[illegible]

***m25[illegible] :** [illegible]?

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]?

? ([illegible])

HON. CHAIRPERSON: If I have allowed Mr. Gaurav Gogoi, how can you speak?

? (Interruptions)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: You are sitting there.

? (Interruptions)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: I have allowed only Mr. Gaurav Gogoi.

***m26[illegible] :** [illegible]

[illegible] : [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] : [illegible]

[illegible]

***m27[illegible] :** [illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible] **:** [illegible]

[illegible] **:** [illegible]

13.03 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Fourteen of the Clock.

14.00 hrs

The Lok Sabha re-assembled at Fourteen of the Clock.

(Shri Krishna Prasad Tenneti *in the Chair*)

-

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Hon. Shri Gaurav Gogoi ji to continue please.

-

***m28SHRI GAURAV GOGOI (JORHAT):** Thank you, Chairperson Sir. I am taking part in the debate on the Motion of No Confidence against the hon. Speaker. A part of the Motion is that he has ceased to maintain an impartial attitude necessary to command the confidence of all sections of the House, that in his partisan attitude, he disregards the rights of the Members of the House and makes

pronouncements and gives rulings calculated to effect and undermine such rights; that he openly espouses the version of the ruling party on all controversial matters. Sir, this is particularly the matter. The way on 2nd February, 2026, the hon. Speaker was presiding over the session, when the Leader of the Opposition was speaking, there was an expectation that the Chair would be neutral. I have the entire debate here. I would request that further Parliamentary researchers can look at the ?uncorrected not for publication? debate of 2nd March from pages 96 to 114, to see the number of times the LoP was interrupted. This is on record, and if you want, I can place it on the Table of the House and verify it.

Sir, the Speaker continued to ask the LoP to verify. But the LoP, when he was talking about an ongoing global investigation into a serious case of child and women trafficking, mentioned that in that ongoing investigation, the name of a Member of the Government of India was mentioned. In this global investigation, the Ministers whose names are being reported, have resigned. It has happened in various countries that the Ministers have resigned, and police investigations have occurred. But only in India, we can see that in this global investigation, when a businessmen, or a Minister is linked, there is absolutely no serious effort to verify whether these reports are true or not. Why is this Government so afraid to conduct a simple investigation into this ongoing scenario? The Department of Justice of the American of Government is doing it. Why should our Government not do a similar investigation? Unfortunately, while the LoP said that all questions which naturally end once, the doubts were officially resolved through such verifications. While the Opposition respects the precious time of the House, while the LoP Shri Rahul Gandhi ji was still there on his feet, the speaker said: ?I will call out another speaker?. Sir, has it ever happened that the LoP, Shri Rahul Gandhi ji is on his feet and the ruling from the Chair is: ?I will call another speaker, you please stick to your subject?? You look at the record to see the number of times Rahul Gandhi ji is saying: ?Please let me speak?. Is this the Parliamentary tradition that we want to show that he Leader of the Opposition is pleading? Mics have been silenced.

This is the hon. Speaker?s remark: ?I will call out another speaker?. Another speaker delivered his speech while the LoP was still standing to speak. It stands in direct contradiction to the established rituals and moral standards of this House. Such a dismissal of the Leader of the Opposition?s right to be heard undermines the democratic spirit and impartial tradition of Speaker?s Office.

Sir, the same thing happened to hon. MP Dr. Shashi Tharoor. He was speaking a few days later on 9th February, and in the middle of his speech, his mic was switched off. In this House, we say that the Opposition has its say. As per Parliamentary norms in Indian Parliament, we say that the Opposition has its say. How can we say that, if you switch the mic off? In the middle, you switch off the mic. On 9th February -- it is on record -- Dr. Shashi Tharoor said that his mic was switched off mid-speech; a move he claimed he has never seen happen in seven decades? history of the Parliament. This is the newest thing that we are seeing.

Sir, I would request the Members of the Ruling Party remember what *Adarniya* Sushma Swaraj *ji* said. Sushma Swaraj *ji,* while speaking beautifully on democracy, on *Bhartiya Loktantra*, said this. [illegible]:

> ?The Speaker represents the House. He represents the dignity of the House, the freedom of the House and because the House represents the nation, in a particular way, the Speaker becomes the symbol of the nation?s freedom and liberty.?

[illegible]?

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Hon. Speaker Shri Om Birla, advised hon. Prime Minister Shri Narendra Modi, at that point of time, not to come to the House for giving reply to the Motion of Thanks, claiming credible information that certain women MPs intended to surround the Prime Minister?s chair and create an unexpected situation. It is shameful - shame, shame, shame.

The 2026 incident is legally distinct because the Speake pre-emptively advised the Prime Minister not to attend at all. It is a complete breach of the charge of neutrality.

[illegible]

[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible]

***m29PROF. SOUGATA RAY (DUM DUM):** I have a point of order. In the morning also, I raised this question: who has appointed Jagdambika Pal *Saheb* to Chair the House?

Now, after lunch, I find you, hon. Tenneti Saheb, sitting in that Chair. Who has appointed you? Are you aware who has appointed you? Are you appointed according to Article 95(2)? Has there been a proposal? Has there been a Motion in this House?

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Sir, there is already a ruling on this.

PROF. SOUGATA RAY: Who has given that ruling?

HON. CHAIRPERSON: As per Article 96(2) and Rule 10 of the Rules of Procedure of the Parliament, already the ruling has been given.Thank you very much, Sir.

Now, hon. Minister.

***m30[illegible]**

[illegible]

[redacted], [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted], [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

[redacted], [redacted] 10, [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted], [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted], to catch the eyes of hon. Speaker, [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] 1951 [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] 40 [redacted]

[redacted] 1987 [redacted]

[illegible] 1954 [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

377

?

[illegible] 64 [illegible] ? [illegible]

[illegible] 17 [illegible] 97 [illegible] 18 [illegible] 93.33 [illegible] 18 [illegible] ? (**Interruptions**)

***m31PROF. SOUGATA RAY:** Sir, I am on a point of order. ? (*Interruptions*)

[illegible] : [illegible] 321 [illegible] ? (**Interruptions**)

PROF. SOUGATA RAY: Sir, I am on a point of order. ? (*Interruptions*)

***m32[illegible] :** [illegible] 364 [illegible] ? [illegible] ? (**Interruptions**) [illegible]?

[illegible]. [illegible] (Assam) : [illegible] ? (**Interruptions**)

SHRI GAURAV GOGOI: Sir, the Minister should yield. ? (*Interruptions*)

[illegible] : 18[illegible], [illegible]? ([illegible])

PROF. SOUGATA RAY: Sir, I am on a point of order. ? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: I will give you a chance. Let him complete his speech. I will listen to you.

? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, hon. Minister.

? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. C. VENUGOPAL (ALAPPUZHA): Sir, he is on a point of order. ? (*Interruptions*) You should listen to his point of order. ? (*Interruptions*)

***m33PROF. SOUGATA RAY:** Sir, Rule 203 states: ?Except with the permission of the Speaker or the person presiding, a speech on the resolution shall not exceed fifteen minutes in duration?. ? (*Interruptions*) Sir, he has already spoken for half-an-hour. How are you allowing him? ? (*Interruptions*) This is as per Rule 203. ? (*Interruptions*) Kindly look into Kaul and Shakdher that unless the Speaker gives express permission, nobody can speak for more than 15 minutes. ? (*Interruptions*) You are allowing him for half-an-hour to speak. ? (*Interruptions*) Sir, stop him. ? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for enlightening me.

? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: The hon. Minister may continue to speak.

? (*Interruptions*)

***m34[illegible] : [illegible]? ([illegible]) [illegible], [illegible] 1954 [illegible]. [illegible], [illegible] 15 [illegible] 2 [illegible]? ([illegible]) [illegible]**

[redacted] ? ([redacted]) 18[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] 1835 [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

[redacted] 349(1) [redacted] 118 [redacted] ? [redacted]

SHRI K. C. VENUGOPAL: What was the ruling at that time? Sir, I want raise a point of order.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Let him complete first.

[redacted] ? [redacted]

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Let him complete.

SHRIMATI SUPRIYA SULE (BARAMATI): Sir, he has used a wrong Hindi word which I cannot even repeat. It is an unparliamentary word.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Madam, please listen. He has clearly mentioned that the ruling was already given.

? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: No, there is no need of any point of order here.

? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted] : [redacted], [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

[redacted]

? (■■■■■■■■)

■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■: ■■■■■, ■■■■■■■■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■■ ■■ ■■ ■■■■■ ■■■■■■ ■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■ ■■■■■■■■ ■■ ■■■■■■■■■■■■■■

[redacted]?

[redacted]?

[redacted]?

[redacted]

[redacted] 2014 [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

?[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

***m35[redacted] : [redacted], [redacted]** 202

(1) [redacted]

[redacted], [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

[redacted] 202 [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]?

[redacted]?

[redacted]

[redacted]?

[redacted]?

[redacted]

[illegible]?

[illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]? [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[redacted] 2019 [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ? ([redacted]) [redacted]

[redacted] - ?The chief characteristic of the Office of the Speaker is ?absolute impartiality?.? Can you imagine the absolute impartiality in this House under the present Government? They do not allow the Speaker to function independently. That is the whole cause of all this chaos. We do not want to bring such a Resolution here.

[redacted] ?It is the symbol of nation?s freedom.? ... ? ([redacted])

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

It is richly ironic. It is a divine *karma* actually that I, the lady MP, was illegally witch-hunted by this ... Government, wrongly expelled by the Ethics Committee, which had no power to expel, after a motion in which I was not allowed to speak, where the Speaker in violation of every principle of natural justice did not allow me to defend myself. Today, I am opening the debate for my party in a Motion of No-Confidence against that very Speaker. You cannot run away from *karma.*

Dr. Ambedkar said that Parliament belongs to the Opposition and the Government should always be on trial to ensure accountability, on the anvil, he called it. The role of the Speaker is that of a neutral arbiter and a keeper of the order of the House. This is absolutely vital to the function of Parliament.

John Bercow, the Speaker of the UK House of Commons, said ?I never aspired to be Speaker of the House of Commons simply so I could say, ?I am the Speaker of the House of Commons? and tell my children that." It cannot be a matter of ego; it cannot be a matter of personal legacy. The post is far beyond that. It is a fitting tribute to the vibrancy of India?s democracy and the strength of India?s dissenting voices that a Motion of No-Confidence was moved against the very first Speaker of the Lok Sabha, G.V. Mavalankar in 1954.

He was accused of openly espousing the cause of the official spokesperson of the Ruling party in all matters and constituted a serious danger to the functioning of the Lok Sabha. Pandit Nehru, who was PM then, participated in the debate and he said that more time should be allotted to the Opposition than to the Government benches. Pandit Nehru, as Prime Minister, said this. What is the tradition we are following today?

In the next decade, in 1966, there was a second Motion of No Confidence against a sitting Speaker, Shri Sardar Hukum Singh. And there it was claimed that he was arbitrarily disallowing questions likely to cause acute embarrassment to the Prime Minister, to Ministers, to top leaders and Government officials. Does it sound familiar or not? Sir, 20 years later, in 1987, again a motion was moved against the then Speaker, Shri Balram Jakhar. Moving the motion was a future Speaker, Somnath Chatterjee, and he said that Parliament is as much in danger from a muted Parliament than from Executive authoritarianism. This is what Somnath Chatterjee said. The resolution was critical of Jakhar's rulings, which denied MPs the right to move adjournment motions. What do we have today? We have the hon. Speaker who has not allowed a single adjournment motion. Every morning, we come here and like a stuck record, what do we hear? [redacted]

Every morning, we hear this.

In the previous three instances, something was different. What happened? In each of the three previous instances, there was a Deputy Speaker to preside over the proceedings. In Mavalankar?s case, there was Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, who was then Deputy Speaker of the Lok Sabha in 1954. In 1966, in Hukum Singh's case, the then Deputy Speaker was S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao. He did not get a chance to preside over the proceedings because the person who brought the motion, Madhu Limaye, failed to get the requisite 50 people, so the motion failed. In 1987, in Balram Jakhar's case, Deputy Speaker, M. Thambidurai presided. But today, what do we see? There is no Deputy Speaker. In the 17th and 18th Lok Sabhas, for the past seven years, the post of the Deputy Speaker has been kept vacant. Article 93 of our Constitution very clearly says that the House of the People shall ? the word ?shall? is used ? as soon as may be, choose two Members of the House to be Speaker and Deputy Speaker respectively. If the post becomes vacant, immediately another one shall be filled.

Then there is Article 95(2) of the Constitution. What does it say? It says, ?During the absence of the Speaker from any sitting of the House of the People, the Deputy Speaker or, if he is also absent, any other person who can be determined by the House?. Today, when the debate started, what did we see? No disrespect to the current Chairperson sitting there, but there was no consensus, there was no spirit of the House that was taken into account. The hon. Speaker of the 18th Lok Sabha, has achieved many firsts. Unfortunately, all of them have been less than graceful benchmarks. He keeps talking about the wanted *?garima?* of the House, but it has come to a point that the minute the Speaker comes into the House, *?garima?* leaves the House. That is where we are today.

I am first going to analyse the hon. Speaker's inglorious record at a macro level, and then I am going to dissect it at a micro level. So, let us look at the macro point ? Suspensions under Rule 374A of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. Now what did we have before? First, we had Rule 374, which required any suspension to go through a formal motion. In 2001, during Atal Ji's Government, you brought in Rule 374A, which gives the Speaker, in case of a grave disorder, the right of immediate suspension without moving a formal motion. And this rule, the way it has been abused by the current Speaker, is the very antithesis of democracy. It is all that democracy should not be.

In December 2023, Birla ji ordered the largest mass suspension in the history of Indian Parliament, suspending 100 Opposition MPs. This one episode alone accounted for over 40 per cent of all Lok Sabha suspensions since 2004. In the last 20 years, he suspended 40 per cent of the total Opposition MPs in one day. Why did he do this? What was our grave error? We wanted a statement from the Government on the breach of the parliamentary security. Was this not a matter of national importance? You tell us. Let this be a fair and neutral debate.

Now, while these MPs were suspended, Birla ji presided over the passage of three Criminal Amendment Bills, without any substantive discussion. I would say that he is ... complicit in ... democracy. But this incident was not a one-off for him. *? (Interruptions)* I have listened to all of you, Mr. Pal. *? (Interruptions)*

-

HON. CHAIRPERSON: The word ... is removed from the record.

? (Interruptions)

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: Sir, please expunge it. *? (Interruptions)* Suresh ji, please let me speak. *? (Interruptions)*

HON. CHAIRPERSON: The word ... is removed from the record.

? (Interruptions)

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: Please remove it. *? (Interruptions)* It will make him no less a ... . Please remove it. *? (Interruptions)*

But this incident was not a one-off moment for the Speaker. *? (Interruptions)* Between 2004 and today, about 245 suspension actions were recorded in the Lok Sabha, and half of this total, that is, 120 suspensions were done by Birla ji alone. That is not all. He is the only Speaker who has suspended only the opposition MPs. *? (Interruptions)* He suspended 100 per cent of these 120 MPs. *? (Interruptions)* About 112 MPs were suspended in the 17th Lok Sabha. *? (Interruptions)* ..., [redacted] ? ([redacted]) [redacted] ? ([redacted])

So,120 suspensions have been done by Birla ji alone. They were all Members of the Opposition, and none from the NDA. *? (Interruptions)*

Let us now look at the numbers regarding suspensions under previous Speakers. The country has a right to know these statistics. In Shri Somnath Chatterjee's time, that is from 2004 to 2009, only five MPs were suspended. Never once was Rule 374A used. Four were suspended due to irregularities in MPLADS, and

one was suspended due to some impropriety on an MP tour. Shri Somnath Chatterjee was a UPA nominee. He presided over turmoil in the House. Advani ji was the LoP at that time. But he never suspended the NDA MPs. He never throttled their voices. He was called Headmaster because he always used to scold MPs. He even went so far as to say that you all are misbehaving so much that not a single penny of public money should be spent on you. But even then, he never suspended anyone.

Then, we come to Meira Kumar ji?s time. She was also a UPA nominee. She was the Speaker from 2009-2014, when Sushma Swaraj ji was the LoP. *? (Interruptions)*

***m39HON. CHAIRPERSON:** Hon. MP, once again, I would like to remind you that any MP who is suspended is not suspended by the Speaker. The House suspends him.

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: Sir, ... I will take your point.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: It is a House. There is a process; there is a procedure. That process is followed.

***m40SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA:** Yes, Sir. I would say that he presided over it. I will change my terminology; ... . Thank you very much. *? (Interruptions)* Perhaps, we should add a tenth member to the panel. *? (Interruptions)* We should add a tenth member to the panel. *? (Interruptions)*

HON. CHAIRPERSON: No.

? (Interruptions)

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: Sir, I am joking. *? (Interruptions)*

HON. CHAIRPERSON: No, please hold on. This cannot continue like this. This is not done.

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: Okay, Sir, I apologize. Please let me go back.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Her previous sentence is removed from the record.

? (Interruptions)

***m41SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB (CUTTACK):** Sir, this type of sly remark should be removed from the record. I also request the Chair to caution the Member to refrain from making such sly remarks. *? (Interruptions)*

HON. CHAIRPERSON: I fully agree with Mr. Mahtab. The comments are against the Chair.

? (Interruptions)

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: Sir, that is fine. Please expunge it. *? (Interruptions)*

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Sougata Ray ji, please understand that these remarks are against the Chair.

? (Interruptions)

***m42SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA:** Sir, we are moving a No-Confidence Motion against the Chair. Obviously, the comments will be against the Chair. *? (Interruptions)* Suresh ji, please let me finish. *? (Interruptions)* Venugopal ji, please let me finish. *? (Interruptions)*

HON. CHAIRPERSON: No, Sir, please do not misinterpret. While she is supposed to talk on the Resolution, she is now remarking on the Chair. This is not done.

? (Interruptions)

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: Venugopal ji, please let me speak. *? (Interruptions)*

HON. CHAIRPERSON: She is now requesting you to sit down.

? (Interruptions)

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: Sir, Meira Kumar ji was also a UPA nominee. She was the Speaker from 2009-2014, and Sushma Swaraj ji was the LoP. She suspended a total of 45 MPs but 70 per cent of them were from the UPA. They were mostly Congress MPs. This is because they were protesting against the bifurcation of Andhra Pradesh. Only 30 per cent were from other parties. Sumitra Mahajan *ji* during 2014-19, suspended 73 MPs during her tenure, of which 25 MPs were Congress MPs, that is 33 per cent, over the Lalit Modi issue. Remaining 67 per cent were AIADMK MPs suspended over the Cauvery issue and TDP MPs suspended over the Andhra Pradesh special status issue.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Once again, Madam, let me again remind you. There is a process regarding proceedings of the House. It is the House that decides.

? (Interruptions)

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: ... ? (*Interruptions*) Sir, the second macro point.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: I will have to interrupt you because you are not correcting the course.

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: Yes, the second macro point. ? (*Interruptions*) Venugopal ji. ? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Sir, hon. MP has requested you not to interrupt her. She has already requested.

? (*Interruptions*)

SUSHRI MAHUA MOITRA: The second macro point is the decline in the number of Bills being sent for scrutiny to Parliamentary Standing Committees under the guardianship of the Speaker.

Let me change my terminology. Parliamentary Sta Committees were formed in 1993 for what? To scrutinise Bills. The 14th and 15th Lok Sabhas, with the UPA Governments in the plus, sent 60 per cent and 71 per cent of Bills respectively to the Parliamentary Standing Committee. What happened from 2014 to 2019? During the 16th Lok Sabha, only 27 per cent of Bills were sent. What happened in the last Lok Sabha? Sir, 16 per cent of Bills were sent. The way it is going in this Lok Sabha, God knows what will happen. It will become single digit probably.

Now, let us look for a more detailed dissection. The Office of the Leader of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha was accorded statutory recognition under the Salary and Allowances of Leaders of Opposition in Parliament Act, 1977. It is equivalent to that of a Cabinet Minister in rank. Ram Subhag Singh from Buxar, Bihar was the first recognised LoP in the 4th Lok Sabha from the Congress, which was the Kamaraj, Morarji Desai Syndicate. That was the first time any party had won 10 per cent of seats in the Parliament.

Now, the first statutory LoP was C. M. Stephen. He was MP from Idukki in Kerala. Since the post was given statutory recognition, there have been 12 LoPs. Three times, the term has been vacant. Of these 12, six were from Congress, five were from BJP, and one was Babu Jagjivan Ram from the Janata Party. So, it has been pretty evenly distributed. Each of the BJP LoPs, L. K. Advani *ji*, Atal Bihari Vajpayee *ji*, Sushma Swaraj *ji*, has had more than their fair share of parliamentary time and spotlight in the correct spirit that the Opposition owns the House. It was not denied to them. In 2012, Sushma Swaraj *ji*, then the BJP's leader in the Lok Sabha, even said, ?Not allowing Parliament to function is also a form of democracy like any other form.? That we have also seen. So, in the Lok Sabha, past Speakers have allowed not just the LoP, but also senior Members to intervene in debates. For example, former Prime Minister Chandra Shekhar *ji*, when he came back in 1996 as the sole Member of the Samajwadi Janata Party, often stood up and was allowed to speak.

In March 1997, Biju Patnaik *ji* intervened. There was a Madhya Pradesh BJP MP called Sundarlal Patwa, who asserted that the mandate was not actually for Deve Gowda, but the mandate was that of the BJP's nationalism, and the BJP should be allowed to form the Government, and Biju Patnaik intervened very sharply and he said, "You people talk of nationalism. Do you know what is nationalism? You cannot know it. His *rashtrawad* is breaking-up the nation into 20 pieces." Patnaik was neither asked to sit down, nor was the House adjourned by the then Speaker.

Contrast that with the current Speaker. In the last Lok Sabha, the 17th, he perfected the art, or under his guardianship, the art of switching off the mics of Opposition Members mid-sentence, of ensuring Sansad TV paid for by tax payer money blacks us all out. And when we stand up, when he says this is a technical glitch, that is okay. We believe it, but I am just pointing it out.

It has become a joke within us Opposition Members, that when we stand up for a zero hour or a supplementary question, we are cut off in 30 seconds saying, ?[redacted]? ■ And for treasury benches, people are allowed to speak endlessly, make unfounded allegations, lies against all of us. The Government has made a ... of parliamentary democracy, and if the Speaker is going to concede to being a complicit ..., it is a very sad day for Indian democracy, a very sad day. In March 2025, a delegation of INDIA Bloc MPs met the hon. Speaker. We submitted a letter raising 12 issues, including the failure to appoint a Deputy Speaker, the denial of opportunities for the Leader of the Opposition and other leaders to speak, and the disregard of the decisions of the BAC. During his tenure, the hon. Speaker has systematically throttled the voice of the Opposition and, by default, the representative voice of 41 crore Indians ? 410 million Indians ? whom we represent in this House. He did not allow a discussion on Manipur.

We had to move a No-Confidence Motion just to secure a discussion on that issue. Do you remember? I remember the hon. Member from Manipur, Dr. Bimol Akoijam. He stood up close to midnight and, with great anguish in his voice, told us that the State of Manipur had been excluded from the national consciousness to the point of invisibility. He had to be given time at midnight to say that.

When BJP MP Ramesh Bidhuri stood in this House and called Danish Ali, another fellow Member of Parliament ? and I will repeat these words because the country needs to remember that they were said in this House ... a ?Muslim? ..., Birla ji did nothing. You failed not only Danish *bhai* but also 200 million Muslims of this country who place their heads on this soil of this nation. Ramesh

Bidhuri continued the rest of the term merrily; he was never suspended. Birla ji did not allow a discussion on the Special Intensive Revision in Bihar and permitted only a larger discussion on electoral reforms. On every matter of national importance, adjournment motions and debates have been disallowed. ? (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding; he is an MP, he is not a Minister, and I am not yielding to him.

On each matter ? on the Hindenburg issue and the alleged Adani-Government nexus ? the motion was disallowed. On Chinese aggression into our territory, the motion was disallowed. On the one-sided Indo-US trade deal, we had to learn from the US President that there had been such a trade deal. The Government did not tell us, and the motion was disallowed. On the Epstein files, where a sitting Cabinet Minister?s name reportedly appears 430 times and where heads across the world have rolled, again no discussion was allowed. Every time we, MPs from West Bengal, asked why the Central Government was starving West Bengal of funds and why our people were being deprived of their rightful dues, the Speaker allowed the Treasury Benches and Ministers to systematically heckle, dishonour, and humiliate us.

On 2nd February, Birla ji disrupted the Leader of the Opposition?s speech on Motion of Thanks on the President?s Address, citing Rules 349 and 353 to bar the quoting of an article from the memoirs of the ex-Chief of the Army Staff. First, they said the LoP should authenticate it; then they barred him from authenticating it. Yet on 4th February, a BJP MP ? designated as the prime heckler by the Treasury Benches ? furnished books in the House and continued speaking for three minutes. Then Rule 349 was not applicable.

It is an absolutely incredible display of partisanship, when the hon. Speaker informed the House that he had advised the Prime Minister not to come to the House as there was a danger from women MPs. The Prime Minister is too ... to come to this House, and the Speaker is covering up for him in this ridiculous manner, denigrating women without any substance.

Speaker *sahib*, you are no longer fit to conduct the affairs of this House. I will end by saying to the hon. Speaker what Oliver Cromwell said to the Rump Parliament in 1653 and what UK Conservative backbencher Leo Amery told the British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain in 1940: ?You have sat too long here for any good you have been doing. Depart, I say, and let us have done with you. In the name of God, go.? Thank you.

***m43SHRI T. R. BAALU (SRIPERUMBUDUR):** Hon. Chairman, Sir, with a heavy heart I would like to support the No-Confidence

Motion against the hon. Speaker of this House. Many times, the hon. Speaker has advised Members in a simple and humanitarian manner whenever Members tend to exceed the limits; but at the same time, the question arises as to why this resolution has come before the House. Many things have gone exceedingly well.

The main thing is that when the Leader of the Opposition was on his legs, the mike was switched off more than 15 times. The Leader of the Opposition is a part of this Parliament. We used to say that the ruling Party as well as the Opposition are the two sides of a coin. Whatever rights and privileges the ruling Party have got, the same thing holds good for the Opposition also.

What went wrong the other day? He was speaking on a particular issue, and he had quoted from the former General of India?s book. The only reason was that the book was not published, and taking clue the ruling Party had said that the book was not published and that is why he should not quote from it. But at the same time, the actual matters pertaining to the security of India had been ignored by the ruling Party.

Why was he about to quote from the book? It is because something went wrong as far as security of the nation is concerned. Hence, as a responsible Leader of the Opposition he wanted to quote it. But the things have gone in vain. At the same time, the Speaker, who is the custodian of the hon. Members of this House and the custodian of the rights and privileges slipped in favour of the ruling Party. Whenever the Speaker or anybody commits a mistake, it has to be corrected. The corrective measures are being taken today by the Opposition now. It is our duty to correct the Speaker, whoever it may be.

This is not new to this House. In 1954, Mr. Mavlankar, the former freedom fighter and a great leader of this nation, had to undergo such examination/test. After 1954, it was in 1966 against Mr. Hukum Singh. It did not qualify because the numbers were very less and the Motion was not taken. In 1987, it was against former Speaker, Mr. Balram Jakhar. All these three cases went in favour of the ruling Party. We know that today also it will go in favour of the ruling Party. But at the same time, our duty is to see that some corrective measures are to be taken against the Speaker. So, this is the democratic duty that we are carrying out.

Why such a nice man and such a very good gentleman of this House, hon. Birla ji, went wrong? He had suspended 45 Members in 2019. In the past seven years, he has suspended 45 Members in 2019; in 2023, 95 Members have been suspended; and in 2026, eight Members have been suspended. All these are ? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Once again, let me remind you that for suspension there is a process/procedure. It is the House that decides on it.

? (Interruptions)

SHRI T. R. BAALU: Yes, the House has decided on it, but my point of view is that it was done at the instance of the Ruling Party only. He has not done it on his own. At the instance of the Ruling Party the Speaker has resorted to this activity. Hence, when he has exceeded, we have taken this step as there is no other way for us.

16.00 hrs

That is why, this harsh step has been taken. Actually, the numbers themselves will resolve the issue before the House. Being fully aware of this, the opposition has chosen to move a No Confidence Motion against the Speaker. At the same time, the Treasury Benches cannot ignore the fact that this Motion has the backing of more than 150 Members.

At this moment, I would like to remind the House of the lofty thoughts expressed by our affable hon. Speaker, Shri Om Birla ji, in an interview in August, 2019, soon after he assumed the office of Speaker. Let me quote him:

?The House is not run by a majority; it runs through consensus. The responsibilities entrusted to me require me to remain impartial and transparent. It is not enough merely to be impartial ? one must also appear to be impartial. When the Opposition acknowledges your impartiality, it carries significance.?

I sincerely hope that hon. Speaker, Shri Om Birla ji will remember these words and uphold both the letter and the spirit of these ideals in the future. That is the point I wish to convey to the hon. Speaker. With this, I conclude. Thank you.

***m44SHRI LAVU SRIKRISHNA DEVARAYALU (NARASARAOPET):** The last time a regional party shaped the office of the Speaker, it was the Telugu Desam Party in the form of Shri G.M.C. Balayogi. He was the first Dalit Member of Parliament to occupy the Speaker?s Chair. He was also the first Member of Parliament from a regional party to hold that position. Coincidentally, even today, someone from the Telugu Desam Party is seated on the panel. This reflects how much importance the Telugu Desam Party places on Dalits in the country and in the State.

Sir, G.M.C. Balayogi was the person who played a key role in establishing the Ethics Committee. Beyond that, he is remembered for what occurred in the 12th Lok Sabha on 19th April, 1999. On that day, a No Confidence Motion was moved in Parliament. The Treasury Benches lost that Motion by a single vote. Yet G.M.C. Balayogi did not waver; nor did he allow any crisis to arise. He upheld the parliamentary process and safeguarded the Constitution. That was the respect he had for the Chair. That was the standard he set.

Sir, it is against that very standard established by Balayogi that I read this Motion placed today. Three words come to my mind. The first is spectacle. The second is anarchy. The third is hypocrisy. I call it a spectacle because everyone knows that for this Motion to pass, the Opposition requires an absolute majority under Article 94(c). Clearly, we all know they do not possess such a majority. Yet the Motion has been brought forward merely so that the Congress can capture the headlines of the day. That is the sole purpose of creating this spectacle.

Sir, I have been a Member of this House for almost six-and-a-half to seven years. Throughout this period, Om Birla ji has served as the Speaker. I have personally observed the manner in which he has conducted the House. During this time, numerous Bills have been passed in this House ? important Bills that have significantly shaped the country. The Women?s Reservation Bill, the abrogation of Article 370, the Triple Talaq Bill, the Bharatiya Nyaya Samhita, and many others have all been passed here.

More than that, I have heard what Kiran Rijiju ji mentioned about how the Speaker has given considerable importance to ?Zero Hour? and to matters raised under Rule 377. He has also ensured that new Members receive opportunities to speak and adequate time to present their views. But beyond productivity, beyond giving opportunities to many Members, and beyond the Bills that were passed, I respect him most for the way he conducted the House during the COVID-19 period. At that time, everyone was anxious about how Parliament would function. Yet, he ensured that every necessary precaution was taken so that the House could run smoothly and parliamentary business could continue as usual. It is against such a record that this Motion has been brought.

Sir, in the last session of the 17th Lok Sabha, the productivity rate of the House stood at 97 per cent. When so much good work is happening in the Lok Sabha, this Motion has been moved against Om Birla ji. This Motion has not been drafted to succeed; it has been drafted only to create a spectacle and grab headlines.

Sir, the second word that comes to my mind is ?anarchy?. I say this because, as Kiren Rijiju ji has mentioned in his speech, the famous hug in the 16th Lok Sabha, wherein the LOP crossed the aisles, and went and hugged the Prime Minister of that day. On that day, before he did that hugging, he had said these words. I want to read that to you.

?[redacted], [redacted]-[redacted], [redacted]-[redacted], [redacted]-[redacted]?

These were the words that he had said before he went and hugged the Prime Minister. These were the words he had said against the Prime Minister. They were all beautiful words, but what happened to those words now? It is because, in the last Session you have seen, Sir, Bittu ji - he is sitting here - was entering the Parliament, and he was called a traitor. So, when you said all these words, and you have taken a morally very high ground, what is the reason of calling an hon. Minister a traitor? Is this called for? This is completely against the morality.

Sir, the second example I can give you is this. We have seen how the women MPs had blocked the Prime Minister from coming over and giving reply to debate on the Motion of Thanks on the President?s Address. So, the way they have obstructed him was very much uncalled for. Of course, I am not saying that they volunteered, but they were encouraged to come over and obstruct the Prime Minister. The scenes were very disheartening to see.

Sir, this is all anarchy that has been created inside and outside the House. Even yesterday, you have seen the incident, what happened inside the House. Sir, the Motion was given by the Opposition itself, and they have moved a Motion of No Confidence against the hon. Speaker. When the Government was ready to speak on the Motion of No Confidence, they wanted to speak on a different topic. This is the kind of anarchy they are creating inside and outside the House.

Sir, I am unable to understand where this anger and frustration is coming from. Why is there so much resentment in the Opposition? Is it because they lost the elections? What is the reason that they are having this resentment and frustration?

Sir, the only route they have chosen is to create some sort of a disruption inside and outside the House. Only then do they realise that through elections they might not get close to the people. Only by creating such spectacles inside and outside the House and by creating anarchic situations can they get close to the people. That

is what is being visible.

Sir, the Opposition keep quoting two great men in this House. One is Mahatma Gandhi ji, and the other one is Ambedkar ji. Sir, what Mahatma Gandhi ji had said and what Mahatma Gandhi ji had shown through his freedom struggle and the movement for the Independence. Whenever people told him, people reminded him of how the US got the independence, how the French got the independence, he stood steadfast and said, ?India will get the independence in a different way, in a non-violent way, and in Satyagraha way?. He had gone not only to a different level, but also taken his countrymen along with him. That is what Mahatma Gandhi had shown. Instead of quoting Mahatma Gandhi and his words, I wish and hope that they not only repeat them but also actually follow what he said. The other great man I want to remind them of is B. R. Ambedkar ji. They always come to the House and outside the House showing the Constitution of India, but I request them what B.R. Ambedkar ji had said on the last Session of the Constituent Assembly. He has mentioned about the grammar of anarchy. In that Ambedkar ji had said and warned:-

> ?any method inside or outside the Parliament prioritises political victory over constitutional order, this Motion is, over constitutional order, it is called anarchy.?

Sir, this Motion is certainly that anarchic Motion. So, the third word that comes to my mind is the ?hypocrisy?. There are a lot of hon. Members who have spoken about it.

Sir, just now Mohammad ji mentioned how previous Speakers have performed. In that, he has taken the name of former Speaker, Meira Kumar.

Sir, when they are talking about all this, it is so hypocritical and ironic. I want to remind this House as to what happened when the Congress was in power in 2014. When the Congress was in power and their Member, Shrimati Meira Kumar, was sitting in Chair, what happened during the Session? It was the time of their last session, from 5th February to 18th February, 2014. There was a Bill that was introduced in the Parliament. The Bill was regarding bifurcation of a State, which was rejected vehemently by the State Assembly. No other Bill regarding the bifurcation of a State had come to the Parliament when the State Assembly had rejected it. But this Bill was bought to the Parliament. Next, what they did was that they tried to introduce the Bill in the House. Then, disruptions happened. Shrimati Sushma Swaraj ji specifically, after she came and sat in the House, said that I could never hear the Bill was being introduced, but still, going across the lines, they said the Bill was introduced.

Next, what they did was, they suspended 18 MPs, including the MPs of the Congress. Just now Ms. Mahua ji has mentioned that she had suspended the Congress MPs. She did not suspend the Congress MPs just like that. She suspended them so that that unconstitutional Bill could be passed. That is what she had done at that time.

Then, there was No Confidence Motion that had been mooted that had also been sidelined. On top of that, on 18th February, 2014, which was the last session of their term and they called it the black day in the Parliament, because on that day, the same Bill, the Andhra Pradesh Reorganisation Act, 2014 which was reported for passing, was passed by closing all the doors and all the galleries of the Lok Sabha. We close the doors of the Parliament only when there is voting happening in the Parliament. But there was no voting happening in the Parliament at that time. Still they closed the door and made sure that the Bill was passed on that date.

On top of that, it was also the first time the live telecast was shut down. When an RTI was filed asking when was the last time when the live telecast was shut down, there was no precedence. Also, the live telecast never stopped after that time. It was only for that day, for that one-and-a-half hour that the live telecast was shut down. That is what had happened in the Lok Sabha.

The TMC Members were there on that day and they were objecting to the shutting down of the live telecast. Even Prof. Sougata Roy was there on that day. On that day, when Prof. Sougata Roy ji and Shri Asaduddin Owaisi ji were asking for the Division on Andhra Pradesh Reorganisation Act, they did not accept the Division; they went on for voice vote. Even till now, after 12 years, we do not know how many people had voted in favour and how many against. It was showing 167 in favour and zero against. When the Member was asking for division, how can you say that there was no one against it? That is how much the democracy was trampled on that day, that is, on 13th February, 2014. That happened on that day in the Lok Sabha.

I want to remind this House, how many Articles, how many rules have been broken on 13th February, 2014. The Bill rejected by Andhra Assembly was introduced in the Parliament by subverting Article 3 of the Constitution. They subverted Rule 31 of the Lok Sabha Procedure by introducing that Bill through Supplementary List of Business. Again, they subverted Rules 373 and 374 of Lok Sabha Procedure by suspending the MPs from Andhra Pradesh. Again, they subverted Rule 198 of the Lok Sabha by not taking up the No Confidence Motion. Again, the Congress had subverted Rule 367(1) of the Lok Sabha by passing the Bill by

voice, despite the demand for the Division. This is what the Congress had done and now they are coming and preaching about Constitutional morality. They are coming here and preaching about how the Chair should function, how the Speaker should function. This is the most hypocritical thing. I do not think we should have to hear it to this day.

Let me conclude it. Obviously, like every other party, we also have some consensus. Right now, the TMC party has one of the youngest Members of Parliament. Of course, we have consensus. We keep asking for supplementaries to the Speaker, like the Private Members etc. and we keep rising with it. How do we engage? We engage through dialogue, we resolve through cooperation. We do not file these motions which are designed to fail. We do not stage spectacles. We do not create anarchy and blame the Chair.

Sir, this Motion is a spectacle without substance; anarch disguised as principle; and hypocrisy dressed as accountability. It must be rejected. I request not just the Members in the NDA but also the Members in the INDI Alliance to vote against this Motion.

Sir, through you, I also request Kiren Rijiju *ji* one thing. What happened on 13th February, 2014? It was a dark day, a black day in the Lok Sabha. I want a special discussion to be taken up on that issue in this House.Thank you very much.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

Now, Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh *ji*.

***m45[illegible]**

16.19 hrs (Shrimati Sandhya Ray *in the Chair*)

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] 2018 [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] 1975 [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

***m46[redacted] (*[redacted]) :** [redacted]

[redacted] :- ?Sir, with anguish but no animosity.? The same thing is here also.

?With anguish but no animosity, with seriousness but no motive except the purest one and impelled by a sense of duty, we are constrained to move the resolution against you.?

I mean that time the Speaker was there. Then, again he said, ?Sense of duty like wisdom and patriotism is not the monopoly of

the Ruling Party.? They feel it is their monopoly.

?We on this side are also active participants in the parliamentary process. We cannot be silent spectators of the near consistent and almost coordinated attempt to denude the Parliament of its authority and utility. We shall be failing in our duty to the posterity if we do not voice our protest and that too emphatically. It is a sad day for all of us that we premise this.?

2014

2014

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

17.00 hrs

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] He suggested that future Speakers should resign from their parties while serving in that office to help ensure its non-partisan standing. [redacted]

[redacted]

***m47[redacted]:** [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

*m48[redacted]

*m49[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

***m50[illegible].** [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[illegible] 2014 [illegible] 1954 [illegible], [illegible] - ?The wording used in the Motion was a gross abuse of one's intelligence, and to ask anybody in the House to support this is to consider that person utterly lacking in intelligence.? [illegible] 72 [illegible], [illegible] 22 [illegible] 2009 [illegible] 2014 [illegible], [illegible] 2014 [illegible] 2019 [illegible] 14 [illegible] 2019 [illegible] 2024 [illegible] 8 [illegible] 2024 [illegible] 2026 [illegible] 2 [illegible] 14

[redacted] 15 [redacted], 16 [redacted] 17 [redacted] 50 [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

[redacted] Mr. Vajpayee had always been helpful and expressed confidence that he would help uphold parliamentary traditions. [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] Whenever the Parliament is in Session, the Leader of Opposition is always on vacation. [redacted]

[redacted]

[illegible] 2016 [illegible], 2017 [illegible], 2019 [illegible] 370 [illegible], 2025 [illegible], [illegible].

[illegible] 2012 [illegible], 2018 [illegible], 2013 [illegible].

[illegible]: [illegible].

? ([illegible])

[illegible]. [illegible]: [illegible]-[illegible], [illegible]-[illegible], [illegible]. No matter how bad you are, you are not useless. You can still be used as a bad example. [illegible]?

[redacted] - ?Legislators are not bound by any whip. They must consider the matter regardless of party affiliation.? [redacted]

[redacted]

?[redacted]

[redacted]

***m51[redacted]**

[redacted]

[illegible]? My right to move my hand stops where the nose of the other person starts.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]?

[illegible] India is one of the fastest growing economies. [illegible] and I think it is our collective responsibility. [illegible] ■ Let it be a collective responsibility of all of us to come together.

[redacted]

[redacted]

18.00 hrs

[redacted]

[redacted] 7 [redacted] 8 [redacted] the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker should be chosen, and the reason why the word ?chosen? was used was that the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker should command the respect of the wider section of the House. [redacted] 94 [redacted] : ?We want the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker should be completely independent of the Executive and when therefore it is provided that the Speaker should send his resignation to the Deputy Speaker, it only means that the independence of the Speaker of the House, over which he presides, should be maintained. If he sends it to the President, it means he sends it to the Executive. It is a very healthy principle that the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker should be completely independent of the Executive?.

[redacted]

[redacted] there shall be, not may be, a Speaker and a Deputy Speaker. [redacted]

[redacted], [redacted] [redacted] [redacted]

[redacted] 105 (3) [redacted]

[redacted] That is the constitutional position. [redacted] No procedural irregularities can also be inquired into by any court of law. [redacted] 352 (1) [redacted], The biggest liberty which has been given to every Member of Parliament, in addition to the liberty given under Article 19 of the Constitution of India, is the absolute freedom of speech and expression in this House, which cannot be constrained by the Rules of Procedures and Conduct of Business. The Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business are to facilitate that freedom of speech and expression and not to constrict it. [redacted]

[redacted], The magazine he was quoting is a published magazine. It is in the public space. It is available even now.

The contents of that magazine or that story have not been controverted by the Government till now. The article has not been withdrawn by that publication till now. Something which is published, which is still available in the public domain, I find it incredible that the Leader of the Opposition was not allowed to read from that magazine. [redacted]? [redacted] (interruptions) Anurag ji, when you have your say, when you get a chance you can always revert. But in my understanding, reading from what is available in the public space or not allowing the Leader of the Opposition to read from what is there in the public space is a constriction on the freedom of speech and expression of the Leader of the Opposition. I say this with the fullest sense of responsibility.

[redacted] 1977 [redacted] Among the Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition is *primus inter pares*. He is the first among equals. [redacted] 15[redacted], he used to yield to them. [redacted] '[redacted]' [redacted]

[illegible], [illegible] [illegible]-[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] I yielded. Those were the traditions of this House. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] : [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

***m53[illegible] : [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

correcting the institutional functioning of this House. [redacted]

[redacted] : [redacted], [redacted]

***m55[redacted]. [redacted] ([redacted]) : [redacted]**, [redacted]

[redacted], [redacted] 1947 [redacted] 1951 [redacted] 1954 [redacted] 1966 [redacted] 1987 [redacted]

[redacted]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

? ([illegible])

[illegible]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] 1969 [redacted]

[redacted] 1962 [redacted] 1969 [redacted]

[redacted] 1977 [redacted]

[redacted] 1980 [redacted]

[redacted] 1977 [redacted]

[redacted] ? ([redacted])

[redacted] 1969 [redacted]

[redacted]? [redacted]

[redacted]? [redacted]

[redacted] 1969 [redacted]

[redacted]?? ([redacted])

[redacted] ? ([redacted])

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[redacted] 1954 [redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted] 1987 [redacted] 2012 [redacted]

[redacted] 1990-91 [redacted]

[redacted] 2004 [redacted] 2009 [redacted]

[illegible] 2014 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 2004 [illegible] [illegible] 2009 [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[redacted] ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH: Sir, the Chair has given a ruling today in the morning. ? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted] ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH: Sir, you are allowing.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Yes, I am allowing him.

? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted]

19.00 hrs

[redacted]

[redacted] ? (*Interruptions*)

[redacted]

[illegible] 65 [illegible]-[illegible]-[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

[redacted]?

[redacted], 10 [redacted], 2024 [redacted]

[redacted], 10 [redacted], 2024 [redacted], 2014 [redacted] 6 [redacted] 14 [redacted] 6 [redacted], 2047

[illegible]

[illegible], 3 [illegible], 2023 [illegible] 1990-91 [illegible]? [illegible] 370 [illegible] 35[illegible] [illegible]? [illegible]?

[illegible], 3 [illegible], 2023 [illegible] Modi ji is destroying the architecture of India. [illegible]

[illegible], 3 [illegible], 2023 [illegible] 50 [illegible]

[illegible] 2008 [illegible]

[illegible], 23 [illegible], 2022 [illegible]?

[illegible]? [illegible]? [illegible]? [illegible]? 1977-78 [illegible]

[illegible]? (Interruptions)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Please be seated.

? (*Interruptions*)

HON. CHAIRPERSON: One minute please.

? (*Interruptions*)

[illegible], 543 [illegible]

[illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

achievement in a House as large and diverse as ours.

Sir, what is even more commendable is that the hon. Speaker has made a conscious effort to encourage first-time Members of Parliament. Many young MPs and first-time MPs, including me, have been given opportunities to speak, to participate in debates and to raise concerns of their constituencies. For Members from parties, like ours, the Jana Sena Party who come here with the aspiration of the people we represent, this place is invaluable. We come here to raise the voice of our regions, our youths, and our communities, but unfortunately, what do we often witness is continuous disruptions, sloganeerings, walkouts and ruckus over one issue after another. When the House is repeatedly stalled, it is not the Government that loses; it is the people of India whose voices remain unheard.

Sir, the office of the Speaker is one of the most respected institutions in our Parliamentary democracy. Disagreement is a part of democracy, but attempting to undermine the dignity of the Chair for political messaging is not.

Sir, Shri Om Birla ji has conducted the proceedings of this House with patience, restraint, and respect for all sides. In the face of repeated disruptions, he has continued to appeal for dialogue, debate and dignity in our proceedings. Therefore, I strongly urge this House to reject this Motion and reaffirm its faith in the office of the Speaker under the leadership of Shri Om Birla ji. Thank you. Jai Hind.

***m57SUSHRI S. JOTHIMANI (KARUR):** Thank you, Chairman, Sir. Today, I rise to speak on the No Confidence Motion against the hon. Speaker with a heavy heart and deep responsibility to defend the principles of this House and democracy, and the principles that are under direct attack today. Parliament is the heartbeat of our nation. In this space, people?s voices are heard, differing opinions meet, clash and guide the course of our country. At the core of any democracy lies freedom of speech, dissent and discussion. These are not the privileges given by the ruling party or by the Chair. These are all Fundamental Rights of every elected representative and, through us, of every citizen of this country.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, Shri Rahul Gandhi ji has walked the length and breadth of this country and earned the respect and trust of the people to be their voice in this House, and also has the constitutional responsibility. It is deeply disheartening that this House, time and again, has witnessed that he has been denied his right to speak, because you are uncomfortable with the truth he speaks. You are unable to answer him. Everyone of you is afraid of him. That is why, you stand up in the Parliament and

abuse him because you are afraid of him.

Also, the whole Opposition is not allowed to raise our voice, our consensus, and issues of vital importance. This creates a serious concern about the impartiality of this Chair. When elected representatives try to speak on behalf of millions of people, they are silenced. This is not merely a procedural lapse. It is the fundamental ... of the democratic spirit. The Opposition in Parliament is not an obstacle to the Government. In a true democracy, the Government governs, but the Opposition scrutinises, holds power accountable. Without the Opposition, the Parliament will be an echo chamber. It is not merely that the Members are silenced, but it is about the millions of people we are representing. The credibility of democracy is measured not by how comfortably the Government speaks, but by how freely the Opposition is allowed to constrain. But today, what we have witnessed are troubling double standards, two entirely different set of rules ? one for the ruling party and another for the Opposition are there.

In recent times, the suspension of Opposition Members has become increasingly common response for the dissent in the House. Instead of allowing the Members to express their concerns or register their protest, suspensions are used to silence all of us. Between 2004 to 2009, and 2009 to 2024, suspension rates has increased 2,000 times. This has never been heard in any democracy in the world. Sir, I also have been suspended twice. I remember, once it was for the protest against domestic gas price rise. Even two days before, the price of gas has increased by Rs. 60. But if I protest, I will be suspended. I do not remember the next time when I was suspended, as you do not need any valid reason to suspend us in this House. Even today, my colleagues remain outside this House, under suspension for raising their voice in protest.

Sir, ... This selective application of rules clearly shows why this Motion has been brought before this House. It is deeply troubling that the hon. Speaker, the custodian and guardian of this House, the protector of every Member of this House has chosen to level such a grave allegation against us, the women Members of Parliament, to suggest that the elected representatives, who have come here with the mandate and trust of the people, intended to harm the Prime Minister. It is not only unprecedented but also baseless and profoundly unjust. Most of us in this House come from a humble background. Many of us are first generation politicians. We build our political capital with decades of hard work among people. Facing resistance and discrimination to question our integrity in this manner is a grievous attack on every woman

who earns a right place in public life.

The hon. Speaker knows many of us personally well. H knows from the deepest part of his heart that we all are the women of ideological commitment, integrity, dignity, courage, and conviction. Also, we are hailing from the political party, Indian National Congress, that has always upheld the dignity and constitutional values. And we do know him personally and we have the utmost respect for his Office and his goodself, which is why it pains us even more to see that he chose to allow the Ruling Party to influence and pressurize him to make such a grave allegation against us. Such statements do not merely hurt the individuals, do not insult the individuals; they strike at the heart of this very House, betray the trust that the people place in their representatives, and undermine the very idea of Parliamentary democracy.

Sir, let me speak plainly here. Our protest on that day was peaceful, civilized, and dignified. Even in the videos, that were released by the hon. Parliamentary Affairs Minister, Shri Kiren Rijiju *ji*, my brother from the North East, it could be seen that we were merely standing in that place, holding banner, and peacefully protesting. What is wrong in it? I do not understand. Another video was released from the Speaker?s Chamber. What happened there? We were vehemently arguing to uphold the dignity of the House against the obscene and vulgar remarks made against our respected former Prime Ministers by the BJP MP, Nishikant Dubey. These are the expressions of dissent. Dissent is not against the decorum but is against the erosion of democratic space; against partisanship, and against the system that is a means to safeguard all voices, but which, currently, silences many.

Sir, unfortunately, the Chair and the Government, witho moving a Motion to protest ... demean us for peacefully protesting. Is that a crime? Is that a threat? What exactly is a threat here? Is asking for accountability a threat or is selling this country in the name of Indo-US Trade Deal a threat? Is demanding an institutional autonomy, independence, and neutrality a threat? Or, is compromising every institution, means to safeguard our democracy including the Parliament, the Election Commission, and Investigating Agencies, a real threat?

In the broad daylight, with multiple cameras recording every moment of the proceedings, and live proceedings being watched across the country, we witnessed something deeply disturbing in this House. ... Is this not affecting the sanctity of the Parliament? Is this not affecting the sense of this House?

We also see a situation where a foreign power dictates terms to a sovereign nation like India regarding trade and foreign policy.

A proud and independent country like ours cannot allow a foreign power to decide our economic policy and energy policy by external pressure. Is that not harmful to the dignity of the nation?

Sir, serious allegations were made ... in the Epstein files. Yet, they continue to hold office without any accountability and they are sitting in the same House. Is that not affecting the sanctity of this Parliament? When the enemy tanks are moving, crossing over our border, and when serious challenges are arising from China, the Prime Minister of the country must show leadership and take responsibility. But the Prime Minister refuses to show leadership and take responsibility. ... Is that not harmful? Is that not affecting the morale of this country?

Sir, we have been forced to fight for the rights of Tamil Nadu. We wish to raise our voice for restoring our rights. Funds meant for education in Tamil Nadu are denied by you. You also deny release of funds meant for infrastructure. You refuse to accept our rich history and ancient glory related to Keezhadi and Tamils. In such a situation, if we want to raise those issues in Parliament, you refuse to allow us to speak here. How can we view this? If we speak without your permission, you suspend us.

If all these are not considered shameful, then, how can the peaceful protest by women Members of Parliament, standing with banners to express their democratic protest, be portrayed as a threat?

Sir, these are all the issues that I wanted to raise.

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Just a minute.

Hon. Members, the time of the House is extended till Sushri S. Jothimani?s speech is over.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SUSHRI S. JOTHIMANI: Thank you, Sir.

Sir, these are all the issues that we wanted to raise in the House. But we are not allowed to speak. Our voices were denied, and that is precisely why the protest happened. I would like to remind this House about the historic moment of leadership in this very House. When the then hon. Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh Ji, rose to speak in this same place, Members of the Opposition surrounded him there and even threw papers at him. At that time, Manmohan Singh Ji stood calmly, with humility, with dignity, and with courage. He faced the protests, and continued his speech. That is the leadership this country needs in any democracy.

Refusing to appear in the House and instead blaming the Leader of the Opposition and women Members of Parliament does not reflect leadership. The PM's absence from this House was not due to any threat from women MPs, but due to .... It is .... Leadership is not about avoiding questions; leadership is about facing them.

Let us not ridicule the great institution of Parliament making such unfair, ridiculous, and frivolous allegations and treating democratic dissent as a crime. Parliament exists so that difficult questions can be asked and the Government can be held accountable. The office of the Speaker is sacred. It exists to protect the integrity of this House. Its authority comes not from any party, but from the trust of the entire House and through its people. The Speaker must stand above politics, ensuring fairness to all Members and allowing every voice to be heard, whether from the Treasury Benches or from the Opposition.

When neutrality is compromised, Parliament compromised, and the people's faith in democracy falls. A Speaker who protects every voice strengthens democracy. A Speaker?s silence in the face of dissent weakens the very institution he has sworn to protect. Across mature democracies such as the United Kingdom, Canada, and Ireland, the Speaker is expected to rise above party lines and command the confidence of the entire House. India too must reflect on such practices and ensure that the Speaker's office inspires trust across the Treasury Bench and the Opposition, irrespective of the parties in power.

Sir, the Motion is not about individuals or parties. It is about preserving the dignity of this House, the neutrality of the office of the Speaker, and the faith of the people we represent. Today, we must decide whether this institution will stand for fairness, neutrality, and the protection of every voice or whether it will allow dissent to be silenced.

Sir, for the dignity of the House, for the trust of the people, and for the future of parliamentary democracy, I support this motion. Thank you.

[redacted]