



# **Lok Sabha Speaker Om Birla's statement in the House after the discussion on the motion to remove the Speaker of the Lok Sabha**

Posted On: 12 MAR 2026 7:37PM by PIB Delhi

Honourable Members,

In the parliamentary history of independent India, over the past two days this House has held more than twelve hours of discussion on the resolution concerning the third motion of no confidence against the Speaker of the Lok Sabha.

Honourable Members from various parties have presented their views, arguments, and concerns before this House. Members of the Opposition have raised issues regarding the alleged suppression of the Opposition's voice and a perceived lack of impartiality. Honourable Members have also spoken about the impartiality of the Chair, the efficiency of the House, and the global achievements of the Parliament of India. At the same time, Members have elaborated upon the nature of our parliamentary democracy and expressed their views regarding the dignified traditions, rules, and procedures of this House.

Honourable Members,

This House represents the sovereign will of 1.4 billion citizens of India. Every Member present here carries with them the mandate of millions of citizens. Each Honourable Member brings with them the hopes that the problems, hardships, and difficulties of the people will be addressed, and that their aspirations, expectations, and dreams will be fulfilled.

I have always endeavoured to ensure that every Honourable Member is able to express their views on their subjects and issues within the framework of the rules and procedures of this House, and that all Members receive adequate opportunity to do so. This House must serve as the voice of those standing in the last line of society — those who need us the most today.

I have also consistently tried to encourage those Honourable Members who are new or who feel hesitant to speak to actively participate in the proceedings of the House. During both of my terms, I requested all Members who had never spoken in the House to present their views. When Members speak in this House, the resolve of democracy becomes stronger and the accountability of the government is ensured.

This House has always been a vibrant platform for ideas and discussions. In our parliamentary democracy, the noble tradition of agreement and disagreement has always existed.

Honourable Members,

When the framers of our Constitution drafted the Constitution for independent India, after deep deliberation and drawing upon their experience, they adopted the system of parliamentary democracy. Today, parliamentary democracy is considered one of the finest systems of governance in the world.

Under this system, Parliament is not merely a forum for law-making but also the centre of the nation's democratic consciousness.

Article 93 of the Constitution of India provides for the election of the Speaker. This august House has given me the opportunity to discharge the responsibilities of the office of Speaker for a second time.

I have always endeavoured to conduct the proceedings of the House with impartiality, discipline, balance, and in accordance with the rules. The primary responsibility of the Speaker is to maintain harmony, order, and efficiency in the House while carrying everyone together.

My constant effort has been to ensure that the dignity, decorum, and prestige of the House continue to grow.

On Tuesday, 10 February 2026, certain Honourable Members of the Opposition submitted a notice of a motion of no confidence. I have unwavering faith in the parliamentary democratic system established by our great Constitution. Fulfilling my moral responsibility, I recused myself from the proceedings of the House immediately after the motion of no confidence was introduced.

Over the past two days, this House has completed an important parliamentary process of democracy. During the discussion, numerous views, perspectives, and sentiments were expressed before this House. I listened carefully and attentively to every Honourable Member.

I sincerely thank all Honourable Members of this House — whether they expressed their views in support or offered suggestions in the form of criticism. This is the essence of democracy: every voice is heard and every viewpoint holds value.

Honourable Members,

This Chair does not belong to any individual. It is a symbol of India's democratic traditions, the spirit of the Constitution, and the prestige of this great institution.

My predecessors strengthened the dignity and traditions of this House and always enhanced its prestige. Institutions, decorum, and traditions are enduring.

I deeply respect the confidence expressed in me by this House, and I assure you that I shall continue to discharge this responsibility with complete dedication, impartiality, and constitutional propriety.

During the discussion, some Honourable Members stated that the Leader of the Opposition is prevented from speaking and is not given adequate opportunity.

From this sacred Chair, I wish to clarify that whether it is the Leader of the House, the Leader of the Opposition, Ministers, or any other Member — all Honourable Members can speak only by following the procedures laid down in the rules of the House.

Some Honourable Members believe that the Leader of the Opposition may rise at any time and speak on any subject of their choosing. They consider this to be a special privilege.

I would like to make it clear that the House functions according to rules. These rules of procedure were framed by the House itself — neither by the government nor by the opposition. These rules have been entrusted to me as a legacy, and they apply equally to every Member.

Whenever the Honourable Prime Minister or any Minister wishes to make a statement in the House on a matter of public importance, prior permission of the Speaker is required under Rule 372, and a formal notice must be submitted.

No Honourable Member in this House possesses any privilege to speak outside the framework of these rules.

Our country has a rich tradition of respecting the dignity, decorum, and rules of democratic institutions. I would like to cite a few examples from decisions taken by previous Speakers of this House.

In 1957, while speaking on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee sought to present certain photographs related to Jammu and Kashmir as evidence of his statement. The Chair ruled that before doing so, the document must first be shown to the Speaker, who would decide whether it could be presented. Shri Vajpayee and the entire House accepted and honoured this ruling.

On 1 March 1958, when Smt. Renu Chakravarty attempted to place a non-government document on the Table of the House, the Chair disallowed it, stating that it could not be placed without first being shown to the Speaker.

On 26 March 1958, when Shri S. M. Banerjee sought to quote from a letter in support of his statement, the Deputy Speaker disallowed it on the ground that it had not been shown to the Chair beforehand.

In all these instances, the House respectfully accepted the rulings of the Chair.

Similarly, in numerous instances in both the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, documents have not been permitted to be quoted or tabled without prior permission of the Chair. This tradition has always been respected. Members may personally agree or disagree with the decision of the Chair, but it remains my duty to enforce the rules, procedures, and traditions of the House.

Whenever certain Members behave in a manner contrary to the decorum of the House, I am compelled to take strict decisions in order to preserve the dignity of this institution.

During the discussion, a distinguished Honourable Member referred to Article 105 of the Constitution regarding the freedom of speech of Members in Parliament.

Allow me to read Article 105(1) of the Constitution to clarify the position:

“Subject to the provisions of this Constitution and the rules and standing orders regulating the procedure of Parliament, there shall be freedom of speech in Parliament.”

Therefore, while Members indeed enjoy freedom of speech in Parliament, it is subject to the rules and procedures approved by the House.

Rule 352, through its eleven sub-rules, lays down detailed guidelines regarding how Members should speak in the House and what types of statements or expressions should be avoided.

Some Honourable Members also stated that microphones of certain Opposition Members are switched off by the Chair.

I have clarified earlier as well that the Chair does not possess any button to turn microphones on or off. Some Opposition Members themselves have served as presiding officers and are well aware of this.

The system in the House is such that the microphone of only the Member who has been granted permission to speak remains active.

During the discussion, concerns were also expressed regarding respect for women Members.

I have always held the highest respect for all Honourable women Members. My endeavour has always been to ensure that every woman Member gets the opportunity to speak in the House.

I take pride in the fact that during my tenure every woman Member, including first-time Members, has expressed her valuable views in this House.

However, when certain Members crossed the well of the House, approached the Treasury Benches raising slogans and displaying banners, an unexpected situation could have arisen. In order to prevent any such situation and maintain order, I requested the Leader of the House not to enter the chamber at that moment.

In such difficult circumstances, I did what I considered necessary to maintain the dignity and order of the House.

Some Members also stated that Opposition Members are not given adequate opportunities.

However, the official data from the proceedings of the 17th and 18th Lok Sabha present the reality. If viewed in proportion to numerical strength, Opposition Members have received more time than allocated during debates on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address, the Budget, major bills, special discussions, Question Hour, and Zero Hour.

These facts have been presented several times during the discussions over the past two days.

My constant effort has been to ensure that all Members receive adequate opportunity in the House. I have also ensured that Members from smaller parties, single-member parties, and independent Members receive sufficient opportunity. For this reason, I often extend the time allotted for Zero Hour and debates.

Some Honourable Members also raised the issue of suspension.

I have always maintained cordial personal relations with Members across party lines. I never wish for any action to be taken against any Member. Whenever disciplinary action becomes necessary to maintain order in the House, it causes me deep sadness.

However, we must reflect upon why situations arise where such strict measures become necessary.

I have always appealed for maintaining the highest traditions and decorum in this House. Even today I wish to say with emphasis that slogan-shouting, orchestrated disruptions, and disorder have never been part of our parliamentary traditions.

Resolutions adopted during conferences held in 1997 (marking fifty years of independence) and in 2001 in New Delhi by presiding officers, chief ministers, and chief whips unanimously agreed that improper conduct such as slogan-shouting, displaying placards, tearing papers, making inappropriate gestures, approaching the Speaker's chair, staging protests, disrupting proceedings, preventing other Members from speaking, or questioning rulings of the Chair adversely affects the functioning of Parliament and legislative bodies.

It was also suggested during the 2001 conference by the Leader of the Opposition — a senior leader of the Congress Party — that entry into the Well of the House should be completely prohibited and strict disciplinary action should automatically follow violations. These resolutions were adopted unanimously in the broader national interest.

We must always remember that disagreements and intense exchanges of ideas are natural in parliamentary debate. However, there is a clear line between democratic discourse and disorder.

Waving placards, shouting slogans, tearing papers, or climbing on desks are contrary to our great parliamentary traditions. Such behaviour not only disrupts proceedings but also diminishes the prestige of the House.

Honourable Members,

Every Member of this House is respectable, and I personally respect each one of you. In every Member seated here, I see the millions of citizens of India whom you represent.

Honourable Members,

During the past two days of discussion, several Members also highlighted achievements such as translation in 22 languages in Parliament, the use of digital technology, research support, capacity building initiatives, and the successful organisation of events such as P-20 and CSPOC, as well as friendship groups.

I would like to emphasise that these achievements are not personal accomplishments; they are collective achievements of this House.

India's democracy commands great respect across the world. Legislators and officials from many countries come to our Parliament for training. Whenever I participate in international conferences as Speaker, I feel immense pride in our Constitution and our Parliament.

Honourable Members,

Observing the rules framed by the House for the conduct of its proceedings is both our individual and collective responsibility.

If any Member disregards these rules and disrupts the functioning of the House, it becomes the duty of the Speaker seated in this Chair to guide, warn, and if necessary, take action against such Members.

Rule 378 clearly states that the Speaker shall preserve order in the House and shall have all necessary powers to enforce their decisions.

Democratic institutions are permanent. Strong institutions build a strong democracy. If we ourselves diminish the prestige of these institutions, the loss will not be of any individual or party, but of the entire nation.

Respect for constitutional institutions is not merely a formality; it is the foundation of democratic stability.

Whenever there is noise or organised disruption in the House, it creates disappointment in the minds of the people.

I humbly appeal to all of you to cooperate in maintaining the faith and confidence of the people of India in this House.

Our great Constitution, our rules, and our traditions are a heritage that we have inherited. While I take great pride in this heritage, I am equally committed to preserving and strengthening it and ensuring that the dignity of this House is never diminished.

I regard both the Treasury Benches and the Opposition as equal guardians of this institution.

No matter how adverse the circumstances may be, it is my firm resolve to uphold the dignity and prestige of this House. This House has always functioned according to rules and procedures, and it will continue to do so in the future — whether any particular Member agrees or not.

Honourable Members,

Whether there is praise or criticism, my resolve remains the same: to protect the dignity of the House and uphold its rules.

Let us not only follow the words of the Constitution but also uphold constitutional morality.

Let us together begin a new, positive, and constructive chapter from today. Let us move forward united in the path of national service and nation-building.

Thank you.

Jai Hind. Jai Bharat.

\*\*\*

**AM**

