

भी सरकार कोई खास कदम उठाना चाहती है, जिस से विद्रोही नागा पूर्वी पाकिस्तान में जा कर युद्ध की कार्यवाही न सीख सकें और वहाँ से विध्वंसक सामग्री हिन्दुस्तान में न ला सकें ।

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): With regard to the first part, as was not unexpected, Pakistan denied their complicity in this and they have said that they have not done anything. With regard to the second part, the Defence Minister has already said that where necessary patrolling will be intensified in order to ensure that they are unable to enter.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि शांति-वार्ता के बावजूद जो 1500 नागा विद्रोही नागा लोग आ रहे हैं, क्या सरकार उनके खिलाफ सैनिक दृष्टि से कोई ठोस कदम उठाने के लिए तैयार है ।

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I think that is what I explained in my statement and also in reply to some of the supplementaries, that within the three-mile border where the security forces are effective certainly they can, I am sure, prevent them and they can certainly take any severe action that they want to.

12.18 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Speaker: I have received notices of two Privilege Motions. One is by Shri Bade and Shri Brij Raj Singh and the other is by Shri Kishen Patnaik and Shri Ramsewak Yadav. Shri Brij Raj Singh might say a few words about it.

श्री ब्रज राज सिंह (बरेली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री बड़े ने जो प्रिविलेज मोशन दिया, मुझे उस की कापी फावर्ड नहीं की गई ।

296(Ai) LSD—4.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नोटिस तो माननीय सदस्य की तरफ से आया है । तो क्या कापी मैं ने फावर्ड करनी थी ? नोटिस तो माननीय सदस्य दे रहे हैं और उस की कापी मैं फावर्ड करता रहूँ ?

श्री ब्रज राज सिंह : मैं अर्ज करता हूँ कि पी० ए० सी० ने भारत सेवक समाज के बारे में एक लम्बी रिपोर्ट दी थी ।

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : उस के गोलमाल के बारे में ।

श्री ब्रज राज सिंह : उसमें जितने भी गोलमाल

अध्यक्ष महोदय : चूंकि माननीय सदस्य के पास नोटिस की कापी नहीं है, इसलिए वह इधर उधर घूमेंगे । मैं उस नोटिस को पढ़ देता हूँ ।

"I may be permitted to move the Motion of Breach of Privilege of the House committed by the Bharat Sewak Samaj by publicly giving a rejoinder to the recent PAC Report criticism instead of furnishing further information and explanation to the PAC. As a matter of precedence the Bharat Sewak Samaj should not criticise publicly or in the Press the allegations made or faults pointed out by PAC. This amounts to the breach of privilege of the House."

Then he wrote me another letter about the same context. Ultimately, there was a third letter—it is rather strange—on the 15th April in which he writes to me—that was about the public function where the Prime Minister and the Speaker were also present—:

"This is most objectionable and degrading the prestige, faith and

[अध्यक्ष महोदय]

confidence in the mind of the public for Parliament."

But the prayer is rather strange. He says:

"I, therefore, request you that you may raise the Motion of Privilege under Rule 222."

Now, Shri Brij Raj Singh might say a few words about the first point.

श्री ब्रज राज सिंह : चाहे जो कुछ भी बोड़ी बहुत प्रिविलेज मोशन देने में गड़बड़ी हुई हो परन्तु मैं समझता हूँ यह हाउस महसूस करेगा कि जब भी पी० ए० सी० जैसी जिम्मेदार कमेटी किसी भी संस्था के ऊपर दोषारोपण करती है तो वैसे ही हवा में से उठा कर वह उन आरोपों को नहीं लगा देती है। वह उन की गहराई में जाती है, उन की अच्छी तरह से छानबीन करती है और छानबीन करने के बाद बड़े ही जिम्मेदाराना तौर पर कुछ आबजैवशज लगाती है। यदि किसी संस्था के अधिकारीगण उन आरोपों का जवाब न दे सकें और फिर बाद में इस बात का प्रयत्न करेंगे कि जनता में जाकर उनका खंडन किया जाए तो स्पष्टतः ही पार्लियामेंट के विरुद्ध बात मालूम पड़ती है, पार्लियामेंट के विरुद्ध वे लोग आते हैं। पार्लियामेंट की इतनी जिम्मेदार कमेटी यदि कोई अपनी सिफारिशें यदि अपने कोई एतराजात किसी संस्था के ऊपर लगाये तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उनका क्लेरिफिकेशन या तो पी० ए० सी० से मांगें या उस को दे या फिर सुधार का कोई तरीका निकाले। इसके बरअक्स जब वह जनता में जा कर उनका खंडन करती है तो इस का स्पष्टतः मतलब यह है कि वह आरोपों को न केवल झूठलाती है बल्कि वह पार्लियामेंट और पार्लियामेंट की इतनी जिम्मेदार कमेटी को झठा बनाती है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बतलाने की आवश्यकता

नहीं है कि लोक लेखा समिति इस सदन की एक समिति है और इस सदन की बहुत ही जिम्मेदार समिति है और इसी का एक हिस्सा है ? मुझे इस बात का सौभाग्य रहा है कि मैं भी इस समिति का एक सदस्य हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि समिति को जो भारत सेवक समाज को अनुदान मिले केन्द्र से और केन्द्रीय मंत्रालयों से, उन के बारे में कोई हिस्साब किताब नहीं दिये गये और इस की बार बार मांग की गई। उस के पदाधिकारी जो वहाँ आये वहाँ उन्हीं ने नहीं दिये और जब वहाँ नहीं दिये गये तो इस बात को साबित किया गया कि उसका जो खर्च हो रहा है वह ढंग से नहीं होता है, उस का कोई हिस्साब किताब नहीं है, उस के कोई आडिटिड एकाउन्ट्स नहीं हैं। यह ऐसी संस्था है जिस में केन्द्र के मंत्रिगण भी सम्मिलित रहे हैं, उन का भी सम्बन्ध इस से रहा है और पदाधिकारी भी वे इस के रहे हैं। और माननीय नन्दा जी को कहा जाए तो इस के पिता भी कहे जा सकते हैं और पिता ही नहीं बल्कि इसके प्राण भी कहे जा सकते हैं। उस संस्था द्वारा काफी धन खर्चा जाना, ठीक से उस का हिस्साब किताब न रखना जिस की चर्चा सदन के बाहर भी अब तक बराबर होती रही है और जिस की चर्चा कर के लोक लेखा समिति ने बहुत ही सराहनीय काम किया है और जनता की आवाज को सही पा कर अपने प्रतिवेदन में रखा है और उस को ले कर जब यह टाइम्ज आफ इंडिया में निकाला जाता है जिस को मैं पढ़ कर आप को सुनाना चाहूंगा तो वह बहुत ही आपत्तिजनक है। लेकिन उस के पहले जो लोक लेखा समिति ने कहा है उस के कुछ अंश मैं आप को पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उस को पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है। जिस पर आप को एतराज है उस को आप सुना दें।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : जिस के जवाब में यह चीज है उस को मैं सुना रहा था।

"The Committee has recommended that the Planning Commission and the Ministries of Education and Information and Broadcasting should insist on the submission of consolidated and duly audited accounts of the Bharat Sevak Samaj....."

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो काबिले एतराज है वह कहिये। पी० ए० सी० ने तो अपनी रिपोर्ट दे दी है।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : जवाब में उन्होंने यह दिया है :

"Referring to the question of accounts, the spokesman pointed out that audited statements of accounts and progress reports for individual schemes or programmes were regularly submitted to the authorities concerned. A close check was made to ensure that the conditions of the grant were adhered to."

लोक लेखा समिति ने जो आरोप लगाया है उस का इस तरह से उत्तर देना, इसका मतलब तो यह है कि लोक लेखा समिति ने जो कहा है वह झूठ कहा है। जो इस सदन की एक अधिकृत समिति है और जो इस सदन का ही एक हिस्सा है, उस के बारे में यह कहना कि झूठ कहा है, यह बहुत ही आपत्तिजनक है। लोक लेखा समिति का जिस दिन सदन में प्रतिवेदन आता है उस के एक दो दिन बाद ही इस का जवाब इस तरह से आता है कि जो समिति बनाती है वह झूठ है इस को किसी भी तरह से उचित नहीं ठहराया जा सकता है। इस तरह की बातों का कोई अर्थ नहीं है। इसलिए मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि इस विषय को जो विशेषाधिकार समिति है उस को सौंपे जाने की आप इजाजत दें। इस मामले को आप उस के सुपुर्द किये जाने की आज्ञा दें

क्योंकि इस से इस सदन का घोर अपमान हुआ है।

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): I hope you will hear some of the members on this issue.

Mr. Speaker: Should a discussion be held on this?

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): Sir, I rise on a point of order. Rule 227 says:

"Notwithstanding anything contained in these rules, the Speaker may refer any question of privilege to the Committee of Privileges for examination, investigation or report."

Rule 228 says:

"The Speaker may issue such directions as may be necessary for regulating the procedure in connection with all matters connected with the consideration of the question of privilege either in the Committee of Privileges or in the House."

Under these rules I would request you to give your decision.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, my submission is that the privilege motion submitted by Shri Ram Sewak Yadav and Shri Brij Raj Singh should be allowed to be referred to the Privileges Committee. Sir, it fulfils all the conditions under rule 224:

(i) not more than one question shall be raised at the same sitting;

(ii) the question shall be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence; . . .

Mr. Speaker: If I had any objection to that, then I would not have allowed this to be raised here. That consent I have given. Therefore, I have allowed it to be raised here.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I only wish to say that if this privilege motion is not allowed to be referred to the Privileges Committee, that will be a bad precedent. Sir, you will remember, that even the Audit Report on Defence was criticised by the ex-Defence Minister inside the House and this honourable House took exception to that and said that if the Audit Report of the Auditor General is criticised, this House cannot function. There are irregularities committed by the Bharat Sewak Samaj and this Bharat Sewak Samaj is taking advantage....

Mr. Speaker: We cannot go into those things now.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My submission is that this should be referred to the Privileges Committee.

Mr. Speaker: That is all.

Shrimati Benu Chakravartty (Barackpore): May I just say a few words? I think that there is no necessity for us to argue the case. It is a very clear case where certain remarks made by our Public Accounts Committee, which is one of the most important Committees of this House, are being taken objection to in public without having gone through the formality of producing any evidence which they may have before the Public Accounts Committee or before you in order to correct the remarks made in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. As such, I submit that it is a clear case where we should refer this matter to the Privileges Committee without any further argument.

Shri Ranga: The only point that might be raised by Bharat Sewak Samaj is that it is not a part of the Government, it is not a Department, and that it is only a non-official organisation. But even then, certain of its activities, certain of its representatives, have made themselves responsible to deal with the Government, not on the basis that they are a voluntary

organisation, on the basis of being contractors or sub-contractors and so on. Therefore, they should also be held to that limited extent responsible to behave in the same manner as the other Departments and other agencies which deal with Government when it comes to the question of contracts and financial affairs. Therefore, it was wrong of them to have thought of following a procedure which was not acceptable, which was not allowable or permissible, to other Departments and other agencies which are dealing with the Government. So, I request you to allow this to be referred to the Privileges Committee.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): I would like to say a word.

Mr. Speaker: I have made a mistake. I am going to rectify it. Afterwards, I will call him. He may kindly resume his seat.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I will say a few words.

Mr. Speaker: I will call him. I omitted to mention the receipt of a letter that I have got from the man who had made those remarks where that function was being held. It was obligatory for me to inform the House so that they may make a correct judgment. . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This may also be referred to the Privileges Committee. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: I will read only one paragraph.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Who is the person?

Mr. Speaker: He is Mr. Brij Kishan Chandiwala, Chairman, Delhi Pradesh Bharat Sewak Samaj. He made those remarks there. I will read it:

"I am informed that some of my remarks are liable to be construed

as being disrespectful towards Parliament. I have never been in Parliament and I do not know the intricacies and technicalities of parliamentary practice and procedure. . .

(Interruptions).

Order, order. I am in duty bound to put it before the House.

"I have, however, been all my working life a social worker and a humble follower of Gandhiji. . .

(Interruptions) There ought to be so much patience at least that I should be heard.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद):
तब गांधी जी, अब नन्दा जी ।

Mr. Speaker: "I, therefore, respect freedom and democracy and nothing could be farther from my mind than to say anything which is inconsistent with the dignity and prestige of parliamentary institution."

Then, he has argued to a certain extent. Ultimately, he says:

"I never intended to cast any aspersions on the conduct of the Public Accounts Committee or its Members. My whole reference was to the summary as has appeared in the press. Still, I take this opportunity of stating that I should have been more careful in choosing my expression, and I have no hesitation in tendering my sincerest regret and apology for the same."

The Minister of Rehabilitation (Shri Tyagi): So, that is now finished.

Mr. Speaker: I must have read this out also earlier along with that notice.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I think that this is a matter of very grave importance. It is not what Mr. Chandiwala has said with which I am con-

cerned. I am more concerned with what the Home Minister has said in the Lobby of the House before many Members of this House, that the report of the Public Accounts Committee is prejudicial. He talked to the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and he told him that 'Your findings are prejudiced, and you are working against the Congress', and used such other expressions, and those expressions were used before many Members of the House. Also, it is said further that before the report was out, efforts were in some way or the other modified, and important people were approached. I want this matter to be investigated into. It is not a question of Chandiwala. . .

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: Nandawala.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: . . . but of the Home Minister who ought to have been more responsible than to accuse the chairman of our Public Accounts Committee of having been partial and for not having based his judgment on facts. I know as a matter of fact—and you will find that from the report—that the whole report is based upon the findings of the officials of the Government of India.

Therefore, I want this matter to be thoroughly gone into and also the conduct of the Home Minister who has established himself as the clearing-house of all corruption and bribery and all that kind of thing.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): May I seek some guidance from you? . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He can seek that guidance from me afterwards. I find that every Member wants to speak simultaneously with others. That is very regrettable. I

[Mr. Speaker]

have already requested hon. Members that they might just rise in their seats but not begin to speak because that creates confusion altogether.

श्रीमती सुभद्रा जोशी (बलरामपुर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, में यह जानना चाहती हूँ कि जो प्रिविलेज मोशन के रूल्स हैं उन में लाबी में की हुई बात भी आ जाती है या नहीं कि किस ने उस में क्या कहा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर सिर्फ इस पर मेरी रूलिंग मांगी जाती है तो lobby is a part of the House.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: May I just seek one clarification from you? I am not concerned with what Shri Nanda has said, nor am I standing here to support the Bharat Sewak Samaj and its activities. But I do want to ask of you one thing. If certain conversations take place between myself and anybody else in this House in the Lobby, do they become a part of the proceedings of the House? How does that happen? That is what your ruling amounts to.

Mr. Speaker: It is not that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur (Jalore): It is obvious from what has happened in this House that you have admitted this question and we are now proceeding under rule 225. This House is now discussing only under rule 225. . .

Mr. Speaker: Quite right.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: . . . and is seized of the letter which was sent by the hon. Member from the Opposition. You have considered his letter to be a due notice under rule 223; whether he has said that you should raise it and so he has given due notice. This notice fulfils all the conditions laid down under rule 224. Therefore, we are, under rule 225, discussing it. I think there is hardly any room for further discussion on this point.

Even according to this letter, the point has been established, until and unless the Prime Minister or somebody else who were present contradict the statement made and refutes those nasty criticisms of the Public Accounts Committee. This being the position, there is no room for further discussion and the motion must be admitted. It is a matter of fact. That is obvious. But that motion for privilege will have to be restricted to the point raised in the letter. If, as Shri J. B. Kripalani. . .

Mr. Speaker: I am not referring that.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: Then there is no room for further discussion on this point because nobody refutes the facts.

Shrimati Subhadra Joshi: We refute it.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: I wish to seek your guidance on an important matter.

Mr. Speaker: It is a very simple matter. The facts that have come before me have not yet been refuted. I only want to know if any hon. Member wants to contradict or refute them.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): The question is whether really a breach of privilege has been committed.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking first about the facts. Then the second thing is whether it amounts to a breach of privilege or not.

Shri Khadilkar: The statement that has appeared in the press, it is a fact (*Interruptions*). But it does not refer to the PAC at all. The statement gives certain facts. It does not question certain observations on certain procedures to be observed in the future or in relation to lapses in the past. The only thing that has been stated in the statement is that certain works are being carried on by this

social organisation, with country-wide branches, and certain activities carried on by it which are not perhaps known to the public. That is number one.

Secondly, this is a registered body. Usually in the regulatory Acts there is a provision that if a corporate body or a registered body of this nature commits a breach of privilege—assuming it does—then there must be a certain person who is to be held responsible. In this particular case, unless we pinpoint the person who has made this statement. . .

Shri Bade (Khargone): It is a registered body.

Shri Khadiikar: . . . under the present provisions, whom are we supposed to identify as the gentleman responsible for committing contempt of the House? To my mind, the main question is: Does this statement challenge certain conclusions reached by the Public Accounts Committee?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Khadiikar: Or does it give certain explanations independently of those conclusions? To my mind—I have gone through the statement very carefully—it does not at all challenge the ways or procedures suggested to be followed in future. The only thing the statement contains is an explanation regarding the activities which spread over all these years.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: After hearing Shri Kripalani, I feel a little bit of confusion. You have just ruled that lobbies are part of this House. The talk might take place in the Central Hall. Is the Central Hall also to be deemed part of this House?

Secondly, as far as the explanation given by this organisation—about which something appeared in the press—is concerned, it has to be seen whether the same explanation was tendered before the Committee on behalf of the organisation.

Mr. Speaker: When the question of Lobbies is taken up, Lobbies are part of the House. But here, there is no question of breach of privilege by any Member in the lobbies. That question is not at all before us. Why should we discuss it? That was only a hypothetical question put, and therefore I said, "If I am asked only the answer is to this". That is why I qualified it with those words. There is no such notice here.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: May I seek your guidance in this matter? That a responsible Minister should bully the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. . . .

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: They are in the same party.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Maybe, it does not matter. This is a question of the House, it is not a question of party. He is the Chairman of the Committee, he is not an individual. If the Ministers are allowed to bully people like that, then this House is not worth existing. How is this question to be discussed? I want your instructions about it. This is a very serious question.

Mr. Speaker: I have given the answer.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I simply want your instructions as to how this question can be raised. This is very dangerous.

Mr. Speaker: I am not here to tell people how this question can be raised. It is for the Members to look it up and give a motion. If I get any notice, then I will take that opportunity of deciding whether that is in order or not. Otherwise, I am not to answer these questions. If some Minister bullies a Member, what should I do?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): On a point of procedure. It so happens that a very senior and respected Member of the House, Acharya

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Kripalani, has made a certain statement, I presume from his own knowledge, about the Home Minister having bullied the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. You have said that the lobby is a part of the House. I do not assume that to mean that everything which is said and done in the lobby is reported in the manner it is done in the House. But, when a very highly respected, senior and elder Member of this House makes a positive statement about the Home Minister having bullied the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and these two worthy gentlemen are present in the House, I wish to be enlightened about it. If somebody said that about me, I would rise like a shot, but here are these two worthy gentlemen, they say nothing. What impression are we to carry back, what impression does the public carry back, I want to know.

Mr. Speaker: When I said that the lobby was a part of the House, it was so far as the discipline of the Speaker is concerned, that it forms part of the House. I do agree that a very responsible, respectable, venerable Member has made certain charges and has said that there were certain Members present. But whoever he might be, I cannot take notice of these things. Should I start enquiries because one Member has made an allegation against another. (Interruptions). I am not to start an enquiry.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) अध्यक्ष
महोदय.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shall we proceed? I do not follow how the proceedings are to be conducted now, if there are 20 Members speaking simultaneously. Even in a class room, probably there is much better discipline. We are responsible people, sent here by our electorate, and they expect much more noble things from us. So, we should proceed in an order-

ly manner. I am giving opportunities for discussion, and that is all that I can do.

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): By their silence, they are creating commotion.

Mr. Speaker: When I begin to call some spokesmen of the Government, then too I am not allowed. I was going to ask the Government, and I twice asked whether some spokesman of the Government wanted to speak, but when I look that side, there is a row raised here, and I am not allowed.

Shr.mati Renu Chakravartty: It will be quite interesting to hear them. (Interruptions).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह तो मैं नहीं चल सकता कि लगातार आवाजें कसी जाएं। अपोजीशन से मैं दरख्वास्त करता हूँ कि वह हम को ठीक तरह से चलने दें। अगर नहीं चलने देंगे तो यह कार्यवाही नहीं चलेगी। एक एक मिनट के बाद आवाजें आती रहेंगी; तो कैसे कार्यवाही होगी ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं एक निवेदन करूँ, अध्यक्ष महोदय ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त नहीं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : इस सम्बन्ध में नहीं। इस से साबित यह होता है कि लोक सभा की कार्यवाही के बारे में आप बहस करवाएं क्योंकि मुझे खुद बुरा लगता है इस तरह की हालत देख कर।

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): I have very carefully gone through the press report of the statement issued by the Bharat Sevak Samaj. The only impression that I have got—and I am sure the other readers have got the same impression—is that the Bharat Sevak Samaj have tried to give certain additional information about the points that were mentioned in the Public Accounts

Committee report. My main point here is that the entire reply of the Bharat Sevak Samaj does not reveal or does not say anything about the intentions of the Public Accounts Committee; neither does it allege mala fides, nor does it insult the Public Accounts Committee in any manner. The whole tenor and the whole content of the statement issued by the Bharat Sevak Samaj is such that it is absolutely inoffensive. There is nothing in it which can be construed as casting a reflection on the Public Accounts Committee or on this House.

Secondly, Acharya Kripalani was pleased to mention that such and such a thing was said in the lobby.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: You stopped me from saying that.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I have one point here.

Mr. Speaker: I stopped Shri Mathur also. That is not before us. There are two notices, one by Shri Bade and Shri Brij Raj Singh, and the other by Shri Ram Sewak Yadav.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: There is another precedent I want to quote about this kind of thing that happened in this House in 1953 when there was a Public Accounts Committee Report about the so-called jeep scandal in which Shri Krishna Menon was involved. There was a privilege motion of this kind. Certain newspapers had written editorials about it, certain comments had appeared about the Public Accounts Committee Report, and ultimately this question was considered by the House, and the Public Accounts Committee was pleased to withdraw those remarks on which there was a controversy.

Shri Vishram Prasad (Lalganj): The PAC will never withdraw.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I am requesting you to consider this while deciding this.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): I want to make a submission.

Shri Bade: I want to make a submission.

The Minister of Law and Social Security (Shri A. K. Sen): I have had the opportunity of looking through both the notices, one of the 14th April and the other of the 15th April.

May I take the notice of the 15th April first, because that refers to a certain remark alleged to have been made by Shri Chandiwalla to this effect that the Public Accounts Committee's Report is just like Miss Mayo's report. If that is a fact, then, in my submission, it does amount to casting a reflection on the competence of the Public Accounts Committee, but as you have read from that letter, it appears that the gentleman said that he was referring only to the summary of the report as published in the papers and not to the Public Accounts Committee itself. Whatever the fact be, I think the letter makes sufficient amends for it because it tenders apology and regret for it, and this House has always accepted such apology and regret in good grace. In my submission, we should do the something on this occasion also—accept the apology and regret tendered without condition.

With regard to the other notice, it will be my respectful submission that so long as motives are not imputed, so long as reflections are not cast on the conduct either of Parliament or of Members of Parliament or of any Committee of Parliament, any citizen will have a right to place such reports as he wants to place in answer to criticisms which may be made against the conduct or management of any institution with which he may be connected, so long as such expression does not amount to any reflection being cast on the conduct of Committees or Parliament or its Members. That point is quite settled not

[Shri A. K. Sen]

only by the practice in the House of Commons but also by precedents which we have followed consistently in this House. May I only quote one passage from May's Parliamentary Practice which had been quoted with approval by subsequent committees of Privilege with which I have been associated for the last seven years? It is on page 117, in the 17th edition:

"In 1701, the House of Commons resolved that to print or publish any books or libels reflecting on the proceedings of the House is a high violation of the rights and privileges of the House, and indignities offered to their House by words spoken or writings published reflecting on its character or proceedings have been constantly punished by both the Lords and the Commons upon the principle that such acts tend to obstruct the Houses in the performance of their functions by diminishing the respect due to them.

Reflections upon Members, the particular individuals not being named or otherwise indicated, are equivalent to reflections on the House."

We accepted this as a fair statement of the principle which should govern us in the case in which you ultimately decided to reprimand the Editor of *Blitz* for casting reflection on the conduct of one of the Members in this House. The Committee of Privileges of the Second House of People here, when called upon to consider an article in a newspaper quoted the above passage with approval and expressed that the views and statements casting reflections on the character and proceedings of the House and the Joint Committee on the Merchant Shipping Bill of 1958 constituted a breach of privilege. This will be found in the 7th report of the Committee of Privileges of the Second House of the People in December, 1958, page 9. We may also refer to page 147 of More's

Practice and Procedure in Indian Parliament. In my submission that principle is so well settled now that we need not worry about its validity, except to see whether it applies in a particular case or not. In my submission that expression, even if it was meant to apply only to the summary of the report as was published was certainly likely to make people believe as if the original report of the PAC was tainted with the same vice, namely, like the report of Miss Mayo and in this country Miss Mayo's report has a particular innuendo. Therefore, it was my feeling that it was a most unfortunate statement to be made by any member connected with the public institution and I think the views are also quite clear from the side of the Government that such an expression of opinion should be visited, if not apologised, with proceedings in the Committee of Privileges. But in my submission, even the Committee of Privileges have always accepted such an apology openly and frankly and it will be my submission that having regard to the apology tendered, it will not be of any practical use to refer it to the Committee of Privileges any longer.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जब कानून का पता न हो तो सजा न मिले ।

Shri Bade: Sir....

Mr. Speaker: He was not here when I called him.

Shri Bade: I want to reply to the hon. Minister.

Mr. Speaker: No reply.....(Interruptions.) Order, order. He should resume his seat. He was not present when I called him. There are two notices. The Committees of the House are entitled to the same respect as this House is. Every section is represented there. We do not discuss even the reports because we presume that they have the sanctity

of the unanimous decisions of the House when all the sections are represented there. They come to decisions that are unanimous; they have so far been unanimous and the dignity lies in that fact all the more. Therefore, if anybody cast any reflection on the decisions or conduct of the Committee really that is a breach of privilege. There is no doubt. There are two notices. One is a statement by the official. It was no business of any official to come out with a statement immediately after the report had been published. I will request the Government that some action should be taken against him if he has done it. He should realise that it is not his job. When the report of the Committee comes before the House, then if the Government wishes to say anything and contest any findings or conclusion or recommendation of the committee, it has every right to put up its own case and send it on to me and I will forward it to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. The Committee shall again have a look into those facts and defences and arguments and that if they could not agree among themselves, both the statement shall be laid on the Table of the House. That is the procedure that is to be followed. It is very unfortunate that one official went to the press immediately after this report had been presented and wanted to justify all those in the absence of sending them to the Committee itself he was some spokesman of the Ministry. . . . (*Interruptions.*)

An. Hon. Member: Not an official but Secretary of the Bharat Sevak Samaj.

Mr. Speaker: Then the Bharat Sevak Samaj had no right to do that. Therefore, I will ask the hon. Minister who might be having those people to deal with them that they must explain to them. So far as the explanation is concerned, that might be left here. There is nothing to be done further except the request that I have made to the Government that they should make all the officers and

all those connected with these societies also take care; they must take care that the recommendations of the Committee are not to be criticised in this public manner as has been done just now.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What about having a commission of enquiry.

Mr. Speaker: The second thing is about the remarks of Mr. Chandiwala. I was present with the hon. Prime Minister. The whole House has agreed that this is a clear breach of privilege; there is no doubt about it. I do not think that anybody can put a defence there. He has tried to explain that: I am a simple man, I have not had the experience of parliamentary procedures . . .

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): He may be nominated.

Mr. Speaker: He says: I may be excused. Then he offers an apology at the end and says: if I have committed any disrespect, I am sorry for it and offer apologies for that. I think the House would be adding to its dignity if it allowed the matter to rest there. I hope that if this House has not taken any action at this moment, it should not be considered that it would not take any action in future if anything of that sort is repeated. It is a serious matter everybody concerned should take note of this.

13 hrs:

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: May I ask whether our calling attention matter of which we had given notice,—the ignominious way in which our Prime Minister has been treated by the United States—is going to come up today at 5 o'clock or not? It takes just 24 hours, for the Americans to cancel the trip of our P.M. Why should the Government take such a long time to answer our calling attention notice? (*Interruption.*)

Mr. Speaker: That is what I am considering. I am alling for the facts, and then I will inform her as soon as the facts are received.

Shri Bade: Sir, I want to know whether that privilege motion has been

dropped or whether it will be taken up and also whether that is a qualified apology or not? (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, orde. A decision has been taken.

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्रि-मंडल के लोग वाक-आउट कर रहे हैं। यह तो भारत सेवक समाज की बात थी।

13:01 hrs.

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

AIR CORPORATIONS (AMENDMENT) RULES

The Minister of Civil Aviation (Shri Kanungo): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Air Corporations (Amendment) Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. S.O. 1052 dated the 3rd April, 1965, under sub-section (3) of section 44 of the Air Corporations Act, 1953.

[Placed in Library, see No. LT-3199/65].

13.01½ hrs.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

MINUTES OF TENTH SITTING

Shri Siddananajappa (Hassan): I beg to lay on the Table the Minutes of the Tenth Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held during the current Session.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. All those who want to go out may go silently; they ought not to disturb the proceedings.

13.02 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

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

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Has he recovered from his illness?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Yes; therefore, I am here today. I regret I was prevented by illness to be present in the House on the 15th to announce the weekly business. Certain observations were made by certain hon. Members when the business was announced on my behalf by Shri B. R. Bhagat, and you were pleased to observe that I should make a statement in the House today in connection with the points raised I find from the proceedings that some of the points raised were disposed of by you. Therefore, it makes my task easier and I shall deal with only those points which were not disposed of by you.

Shri Daji raised the same chronic question about the Bonus Bill. The Minister concerned—I see from the proceedings with regard to the Demands for Grants under the Ministry of Labour—proposed that he is making all endeavours to introduce the Bill in this House, . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): What about the discussion?

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha: Perhaps he has promised that he is making all efforts to introduce that Bill. After the Bill is introduced—I do not know when it would be introduced here—and if time permits—I do not know how much time would be at our disposal—we shall try to take up the Bill after the House is free from financial business. I would like the House to know the position regarding the time available for legislative business.

After the House is free from financial business which is expected to be over by the 5th May, we will be left with only four working days, namely, Thursday the 6th, Friday, the 7th, Monday, the 10th and Tuesday, the 11th. The total availability of time during these four days would be 17½ hours. If you spend one hour, as happened today, everyday, that also will perhaps shorten that available time. We propose to give priority