

# COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

SIXTH REPORT

(Presented on the 18th November, 1968)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

November, 1968/Kartika, 1890 (Saka)

347A

Price: <sup>60</sup>80 paise

# CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
1. Personnel of the Committee of Privileges . . . . .	(iii)
2. Report . . . . .	I
3. Minutes . . . . .	7
4. Appendices . . . . .	12

PERSONNEL OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

(1968-69)

~~MEMBERS~~ *Chairman*

1. Shri R. K. Khadilkar.

~~MEMBERS~~

2. Shri Surendra Nath Dwivedi
3. Shri Hem Raj
4. Shri S. M. Joshi
5. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
6. Lt. Col. H.H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah  
of Tehri Garhwal
7. Shri P. Govinda Menon
8. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
9. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
10. Shri Raja Venkatappa Naik
11. Shri G. L. Nanda
12. Shri P. Ramamurti
13. Shri A. K. Sen
14. Shri Biswanarayan Shastri
15. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

# SIXTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

(Fourth Lok Sabha)

## I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURE

I, the Chairman of the Committee of Privileges, having been authorised to submit the report on their behalf, present this report to the House on the question of privilege raised by Shri D. N. Patodia, M.P., and referred<sup>1</sup> to the Committee by the House, on the 7th May, 1968 against the Editor, the Printer and Publisher of the *Maharashtra Times*, a Marathi daily of Bombay, and one Shri B. B. Paranjpe regarding a newsreport published in the *Maharashtra Times*, dated the 3rd May, 1968 casting reflections on Members of Parliament.

2. The Committee held five sittings. The relevant minutes of these sittings form part of the report.

3. At the first sitting held on the 10th May, 1968, the Committee decided that, in the first instance, the Editor, the Printer and Publisher of the *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, and Shri B. B. Paranjpe (after ascertaining his address from the Editor, *Maharashtra Times*) be asked to state what they had to say on the matter for the consideration of the Committee.

4. At the second sitting held on the 18th July, 1968, the Committee considered the written statements submitted by the Editor, and the Printer and Publisher of the *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, and by Shri B. B. Paranjpe and decided that Shri Paranjpe be asked to substantiate the allegation made by him regarding the payment of money by Father Ferrer to some Members of Parliament and to furnish to the Committee the names of the M.Ps. concerned.

5. At the third sitting held on the 20th August, 1968 the Committee considered the further explanation submitted by Shri B. B. Paranjpe and decided that he be asked to appear before the Committee in person for examination.

6. At the fourth sitting held on the 27th August, 1968, the Committee examined Shri B. B. Paranjpe on oath.

7. At the fifth sitting held on the 12th November, 1968, the Committee considered their draft report and adopted it.

## II. FACTS OF THE CASE

8. On the 7th May, 1968, Shri D. N. Patodia, M.P., raised<sup>1</sup> a question of privilege against the Editor, the Printer and Publisher of the *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, and one Shri B. B. Paranjpe, regarding a newsreport<sup>2</sup> published in the *Maharashtra Times*, dated the 3rd May, 1968, which read *inter alia* as follows:—

“Shri Paranjpe visited this area on Monday and collected information about the activities of Father Ferrer. He said that he has detailed information about how much money Father Ferrer has paid to some of the MPs to help him to get the extension order. He also said that he is going to inform the President of India about this and demand that the President should look into the activities of these Members of Parliament.”

9. While raising the question of privilege, Shri D. N. Patodia stated:—

“This report refers to two months’ extension granted to Father Ferrer to stay in India as announced by the hon. Home Minister in Parliament on 22nd April, 1968.

Several Members of Parliament belonging to various parties had made representations both to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister. The allegation that some Members of Parliament took cash from Father Ferrer to help him to get the extension order is not only libellous but also a breach of privilege and contempt of this House.”

10. The matter was then referred to the Committee of Privileges.

## III. FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

11. Shri G. S. Talwalkar, the Editor, and Shri P. L. Sah, the Printer and Publisher of the *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, in their joint written statement dated the 18th May, 1968 submitted to the Committee stated as follows:—

“May we sir, put a few facts about the said news-item before you? The paper has nothing to do with Shri Paranjpe. He is the president of an institution named Sheel Samvardhan Sanstha (Character building institution) and is the editor of a periodical named *Sadachar Bharati*. His address is: Shri B. B. Paranjpe Editor—*Sadachar Bharati*, Block No. 487, Building No. 29, Adarshnagar, Worli, Bombay-18.

1. *Ibid.*

2. Original in Marathi. English translation of the newsreport furnished by Shri D. N. Patodia, M.P., is given at Appendix I.

We feel that the news-item should not have been published. It was published inadvertently but *bona fide*.

We would like to assure the Committee of Privileges that we have no intention of casting any aspersions on the integrity of the honourable members.

We, therefore, hereby, tender our apology and assure that we would make whatever other reasonable amends, if any, considered necessary by the Committee.

We may add that it is not usual to furnish the name of our correspondent, particularly when we are tendering an unqualified apology."

12. Shri B. B. Paranjpe, in his letter<sup>1</sup>, dated the 5th June, 1968 to the Committee stated that the English translation of the impugned newsreport furnished by Shri D. N. Patodia, M.P., was not correct. He also requested that he be informed as to how he had committed a breach of privilege and contempt of the House. In the letter<sup>2</sup>, dated the 13th June, 1968, Shri Paranjpe was asked to furnish to the Committee what according to him would be the correct English translation of the impugned newsreport. The complaint of breach of privilege against him was also explained to him once again.

13. Shri B. B. Paranjpe, in his letter<sup>3</sup>, dated the 27th June, 1968, furnished his own English translation of the impugned newsreport and stated that "what was referred to in the news-item did not form part of, nor had it any bearing on, the business of the Parliament".

14. As the Committee did not find any substantial difference between the English translation of the impugned newsreport given by Shri D. N. Patodia, M.P., and that furnished by Shri B. B. Paranjpe and were also not satisfied with the explanations submitted by Shri Paranjpe, they decided to ask him to substantiate the allegation made by him regarding the payment of money by Father Ferrer to some Members of Parliament and to furnish to the Committee the names of the M.Ps. concerned.

15. Shri B. B. Paranjpe neither submitted any proof nor did he give any names. In his letter<sup>4</sup> dated the 9th August, 1968, he, however, stated *inter alia* as follows:

"I am the Chairman of the National Character Developing Organisation, Bombay....."

1. See Appendix II.

2. See Appendix III.

3. See Appendix IV.

4. See Appendix V.

Public knows that, I am the Chairman of the above-named organisation and that I had gone to Manmad to make personal enquiries of the affairs of Father Ferrer. I did make enquiry in this matter and I obtained necessary information which is confidential in its nature.

The organisation can only make report to the President of Bharat and to no other.

It so happened that the Press correspondent of *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, met me at Manmad and I had casually told him what is published in *Maharashtra Times*, dated 3rd May, 1968.

This being a confidential inquiry, meant for the submission of a report to the President only, I beg to state that said report in *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, has not made any reference to any particular individual member of Parliament. Unless and until a reference to a particular Member of Parliament is made, no proof of the above said allegation can be given as per judicial principles administered in our country. Hence I am sorry to say that I cannot disclose the name of particular Member of Parliament at this stage.

I believe that vague allegations against any unnamed individual is not open for any inquiry as per rulings of the Speaker in several other matters.....

So I cannot disclose any information in respect of any Member of the Parliament at this stage.

Then I have not committed any breach of privileges of members of Parliament nor I have lowered them in the public eye, nor have defamed them.

I may add that I have the highest respect for Honourable Members of the august body of our Parliament which guides the destiny of our nation."

16. The Committee, therefore, decided to examine Shri Paranjpe in person.

17. Shri B. B. Paranjpe, in his evidence before the Committee, stated that what he had heard at Manmad was only a loose and vague talk and that he had no direct or specific evidence of any money having been paid to any member of Parliament and nor was it possible for him to give any names. He said that he "had a casual talk with" the correspondent of *Maharashtra Times* and he "never thought that it will be published". Shri Paranjpe admitted that he had "committed a mistake" and expressed his sincere regret. He

then submitted to the Committee the following written statement (both in English and Marathi) on the 29th August, 1968:

“Towards the end of April, 1968, I had gone to Manmad to enquire into the activities of Father Ferrer with a view to submit a memorandum to the President of India on his activities. People there vaguely talked about Father Ferrer having paid lots of Money to many persons, including some Members of Parliament, for getting his deportation order cancelled by Government. I mentioned this casually to the correspondent of the *Maharashtra Times*. This was not meant for publication. I have no direct evidence of any payment having been made to any member of Parliament. I had no intention of casting any reflection on Members of Parliament or to lower the dignity of Parliament. I offer my sincere regret for this matter having been published in the *Maharashtra Times, Bombay*.”

Shri Paranjpe also undertook to get the Marathi version of his above statement published<sup>1</sup> in the *Maharashtra Times, Bombay*, as soon as it restarted publication after the recent strike by Pressmen.

18. It is well established that speeches and writings reflecting upon members concerning their character or conduct as such members constitute breach of privilege and contempt of the House. As stated by *May*:

“Analogous to molestation of Members on account of their behaviour in Parliament are speeches and writings reflecting upon their conduct as Members. On 26 February 1701, the House of Commons resolved that to print or publish any libels reflecting upon any member of the House for or relating to his service therein, was a high violation of the rights and privileges of the House.

‘Written imputations, as affecting a Member of Parliament, may amount to breach of privilege, without, perhaps, being libels at common law’, but to constitute a breach of privilege a libel upon a Member must concern the character or conduct of the Member in that capacity.

As examples of speeches and writings which have been held to constitute breaches of privilege or contempts may be mentioned:

\*                     \*                     \*

Imputations against Members of corruption in the execution of their duties.”

(*May, 17th Ed, pp. 124-25*)

<sup>1</sup>. This was published in the *Maharashtra Times, Bombay*, dated the 7th November, 1968



19. The Committee feel that in view of the unqualified apology tendered by the Editor and the Printer and Publisher of the *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, and the sincere regret expressed by Shri B. B. Paranjpe, this matter need not be pursued any further.

#### IV. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

20. The Committee recommend that no further action be taken by the House in the matter.

NEW DELHI;  
The 12th November, 1968.

R. K. KHADILKAR,  
Chairman,  
Committee of Privileges.

# MINUTES

## I

### First Sitting

*New Delhi, Friday, the 10th May, 1968*

The Committee sat from 14-30 to 14-55 hours.

#### PRESENT

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Hem Raj
3. Shri S. M. Joshi
4. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
5. Lt. Col. H.H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah  
of Tehri Garhwal
6. Shri P. Govinda Menon
7. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
8. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
9. Shri Raja Venkatappa Naik
10. Shri A. K. Sen
11. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh

#### SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

\* \* \* \* \*

3. The Committee then considered the question of privilege raised by Shri D. N. Patodia, M.P. regarding a news-report published in the *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, allegedly casting reflections on Members of Parliament. The Committee decided that in the first

---

\*\*\* Para 2 relates to the 5th Report and has been included in the Minutes of that Report.

instance, the Editor, the Printer and the Publisher of the *Maharashtra Times* might be asked to state what they had to state in the matter for the consideration of the Committee, by the 25th May, 1968, at the latest. In this connection, the Committee approved the draft letter to be addressed to the Editor, Printer and Publisher of the *Maharashtra Times*.

The Committee also decided that after ascertaining the full particulars of address of Shri B. B. Paranjpe from the Editor of the *Maharashtra Times*, Shri B. B. Paranjpe might also be asked to submit his explanation for the consideration of the Committee.

4. The Committee decided to meet again for further consideration of the two cases 3-4 days before the commencement of the next session of Lok Sabha.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

## II

### Second Sitting

*New Delhi, Thursday, the 18th July, 1968.*

The Committee sat from 15-00 to 15-40 hours.

#### PRESENT

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

#### MEMBERS

2. Shri Hem Raj
3. Shri S. M. Joshi
4. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
5. Shri P. Govinda Menon
6. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
7. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
8. Shri Raja Venkatappa Naik
9. Shri P. Ramamurti
10. Shri Biswanarayan Shastri
11. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh

## SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

\* \* \* \*

3. The Committee then considered the question of privilege regarding a news-report published in the *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, dated the 3rd May, 1968, containing the alleged statement of one Shri B. B. Paranjpe that "he has detailed information about how much money Father Ferrer has paid to some of the M.Ps. to help him to get the extension order".

The Committee accepted the unqualified apology tendered by the Editor, the Printer and Publisher of the *Maharashtra Times* in their written statement submitted to the Committee, for the publication of the impugned news-report.

The Committee were, however, not satisfied with the explanations submitted by Shri B. B. Paranjpe and decided that he be asked to substantiate the allegation made by him regarding the payment of money by Father Ferrer to some M.Ps. and to furnish the names of the M.Ps. concerned. The Committee also decided that Shri B. B. Paranjpe be asked to appear before the Committee in person for examination on Monday, the 5th<sup>1</sup> August, 1968 at 16-00 hours.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

 III

## Third Sitting

*New Delhi, Tuesday, the 20th August, 1968.*

The Committee sat from 16-00 to 16-15 hours.

## PRESENT

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

## MEMBERS

2. Shri Surendra Nath Dwivedi
3. Shri S. M. Joshi
4. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
5. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
6. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
7. Shri P. Ramamurti.

---

\*\* Para. 2 relates to the 5th Report and has been included in the Minutes of that Report  
1. This date was subsequently changed at the request of Shri B. B. Paranjpe.

## SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee considered the explanation dated the 9th August, 1968 submitted by Shri B. B. Paranjpe. The Committee decided that Shri B. B. Paranjpe be asked to appear before the Committee for examination on Tuesday, the 27th August, 1968 at 15-30 hours.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

## IV

## Fourth Sitting

*New Delhi, Tuesday, the 27th August, 1968.*

The Committee sat from 15-30 to 16-25 hours.

## PRESENT

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

## MEMBERS

2. Shri Hem Raj
3. Shri S. M. Joshi
4. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
5. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
6. Shri Raja Venkatappa Naik
7. Shri G. L. Nanda
2. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

## SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

## WITNESS

Shri B. B. Paranjpe.

2. Shri B. B. Paranjpe was called in and examined by the Committee on oath.

3. Shri B. B. Paranjpe expressed his sincere regret to the Committee and undertook to submit to the Committee a written statement expressing his regret on the remarks which he said had been casually made and were not intended for publication and which statement he would get published in the Press contradicting his impugned remarks published in the *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, dated the 3rd May, 1968 and expressing regret for the same.

*(The witness then withdrew)*

4. The Committee authorised the Chairman to scrutinise and accept on behalf of the Committee the written statement to be submitted by Shri B. B. Paranjpe as promised by him to the Committee.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

V

**Fifth Sitting**

*New Delhi, Tuesday, the 12th November, 1968.*

The Committee sat from 16.00 to 16.20 hours.

**PRESENT**

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

**MEMBERS**

2. Shri Surendra Nath Dwivedi

3. Shri Hem Raj

4. Shri Bal Raj Madhok

5. Shri H. N. Mukerjee

6. Shri Anand Narain Mulla

7. Shri G. L. Nanda

8. Shri Biswanarayan Shastri

9. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

**SECRETARIAT**

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee noted that Shri B. B. Paranjpe had published his regret in the *Maharashtra Times*, dated the 7th November, 1968. The Committee then considered their draft Sixth Report and adopted it.

3. After careful consideration, the Committee decided that the evidence given before the Committee need not be appended to the Report of the Committee.

4. The Committee authorised the Chairman and, in his absence, Shri G. L. Nanda, to present their Sixth Report to the House on the 18th November, 1968.

\* \* \* \* \*

*The Committee then adjourned.*

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX I

(See para 8 of the Report)

[ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE NEWS-REPORT IN THE 'MAHARASHTRA TIMES' DATED THE 3RD MAY, 1968 FURNISHED BY SHRI D. N. PATODIA, M.P.]

Manmad, 2nd May 1968.

(From our correspondent)

Shri B. B. Paranjpe *alias* Bab Paranjpe, the President of Rashtriya Sheela Samvardhan Samsta, said that he is going to make a request to the President of India to intervene and cancel the extension order of two months granted to Father Ferrer and that he should be permanently deported.

Shri Paranjpe visited this area on Monday and collected information about the activities of Father Ferrer. He said that he has detailed information about how much money Father Ferrer has paid to some of the MPs to help him to get the extension order. He also said that he is going to inform the President of India about this and demand that the President should look into the activities of these MPs.

## APPENDIX II

(See para 12 of the Report)

### THE NATIONAL CHARACTER DEVELOPING ORGANISATION

Block No. 487

Place Bombay,

Building No. 29

Date 5th June, 1968.

Adarshnagar

Worli, Bombay-18.

Ref. No.—

To

Shri M. C. Chawla,

Dy. Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat,

Parliament House,

New Delhi-1.

Sir,

Received your letter, dated 22nd May, 1968 on 3rd June 1968, bearing No. 18/2/C-I/68 calling upon me to give my say in the matter for the consideration of the Committee of the privileges initially so as to enable the said Committee whether to proceed further or not.

I had met the Press Correspondent of *Maharashtra Times* at Manmad and I spoke to him about Father Ferrer in my regional Marathi Language and the *Maharashtra Times* in its issue of 3rd May 1968 has correctly reproduced the conversation.

The accompaniment of your notice gives a version in English which I beg to say is not the correct translation of what has appeared in the issue of 3rd May 1968 of *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay.

I would wish the Honourable M.P. Shri D. N. Patodia should have got the correct version of the report appearing in *Maharashtra Times* and then I am sure he would not have moved the Honourable Parliament for the Motion of Privilege.

But as a letter calling upon me has been issued by Privileges Committee to me calling upon me about my say in this behalf, I beg to state that whatever talk I had with the Correspondent of *Maharashtra Times* and which has appeared in the issue of 3rd May 1968



is not at all libellous much less, any breach of privilege or any contempt of House is committed. I have never violated the rules and regulations of the Parliament and the privileges of M.Ps.

To be frank, I failed to understand as to what privilege has been breached and how, the House has been brought into contempt by my remarks. It is needless to add, that even the privileges of M.Ps. have their limitations and remark against some members in their individual capacity is no reflection on the House of which they are the Members.

I do request you to let me know the breach of which specific privilege is alleged to have been committed by me and I would be highly obliged if I am informed as to how I committed the contempt of the House. On getting the clarification on the points of privilege and contempered House, I may be permitted to submit my detailed explanation on those points

Yours faithfully,  
Sd/- B. B. PARANJPE.

### APPENDIX III

(See para 12 of the Report)

CONFIDENTIAL  
MOST IMMEDIATE

#### Registered Ack. Due

No. 18/2/C-I/68

Dated the 13th June, 1968.

From

Shri D. C. Pande,  
Under Secretary.

To

Shri B. B. Paranjpe,  
Editor—Sadachar Bharati,  
Block No. 487, Building No. 29,  
Adarshanagar, Worli,  
BOMBAY-18.

Sir,

With reference to your letter, dated the 5th June, 1968, in the matter of the question of breach of privilege against you, I am directed by the Chairman of the Committee of Privileges to request you kindly to furnish what according to you would be the correct English translation of the impugned news-report containing your remarks (published in the *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay, dated the 3rd May, 1968), for the consideration of the Committee of Privileges.

2. As you must have seen from the extract of proceedings of the Lok Sabha, dated the 7th May, 1968 (Copy already sent to you), when the question of privilege against you was raised, the question of breach of privilege against you has arisen in respect of the allegation contained in the following sentence of the impugned news-report, reportedly made by you:—

“He said that he has detailed information about how much money Father Ferrer has paid to some of the MPs to help him to get the extension order.”

While raising the question of privilege in the House, Shri D. N. Patodia, M.P., had contended that "the allegation that some Members of Parliament took cash from Father Ferrer to help him to get the extension order is not only libellous but also a breach of privilege and contempt of this House.

3. You are requested to submit your detailed explanation in the matter, as stated by you, as also the correct English translation of the impugned news-report, for the consideration of the Committee of Privileges, by the 25th June, 1968, *at the latest*.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours faithfully,  
Sd/- D. C. PANDE,  
*Under Secretary.*

## APPENDIX V

(See para. 15 of the Report)

### THE NATIONAL CHARACTER DEVELOPING ORGANISATION

Block No. 487, Bldg. No. 29,  
Adarshnagar, Worli,  
Bombay-18.

Ref. No. 128/68

Place Bombay.

Dated 9th August, 1968.

From:

Shri B. B. Paranjpe,  
Bombay.

To

Shri M. C. Chawla,  
Deputy Secretary,  
Lok Sabha Secretariat,  
Parliament House,  
New Delhi.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 18/2/C-I/68, dated 31st July, 1968 I am submitting my reply.

I am the Chairman of the National Character Developing Organisation, Bombay, which has been registered in 1963 at Bombay.

Our organisation anxiously watches any disturbance of the National Character of the citizens of India and also any anti-National activity.

The aims and objects of the organisation are enumerated in our constitution.

The most important amongst them is as follows:—

1. To provide a voluntary organisation to make propaganda amongst the public and younger generation in particular to develop National character.

2. To help the Government machinery and the public to reduce and avoid corruption, waste and embezzlement of public funds.

3. To combat actively the evils of corruption, waste, and embezzlement of public funds.

From these aims and objects, it will be clear that the sole mission of the National Character Developing Organisation is to help the Government machinery in—eradicating the evils and bring about the National character and healthy administration.

This being the sole duty and work of the organisation, it is but natural that when this organisation came to know the affair of Father Ferrer, with criticism in public papers with both ways and debate in the houses.

I, as the chairman of the above organisation, thought it fit to make necessary enquiries in the matter and help the Government machinery with a report on behalf of the organisation.

Our organisation only can submit a report to the President of Bharat, who is whole and sole authority in our country.

Public knows that, I am the chairman of the above-named organisation and that I have gone to Manmad to make personal enquiries of the affairs of Father Ferrer. I did make enquiry in this matter and I obtained necessary information which is confidential in its nature.

The organisation can only make report to the President of Bharat and to no other.

It so happened that the Press correspondent of *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay met me at Manmad and I had casually told him what is published in *Maharashtra Times*, dated 3rd May, 1968.

This being a confidential inquiry, meant for the submission of a report to the President only. I beg to state that said report in *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay has not made any reference to any particular individual member of Parliament unless and until a reference to a particular member of Parliament is made, no proof of the above said allegation can be given as per judicial principles administered in our country. Hence I am sorry to say that I cannot disclose the name of particular member of Parliament at this stage.

I believe that vague allegations against any unnamed individual is not open for any inquiry as per rulings of the Speaker in several other matters.

As an instance, I may invite your esteemed attention to the ruling given by the Honourable Speaker of the Andhra Assembly recently,

## APPENDIX IV

(See para 13 of the Report)

### THE NATIONAL CHARACTER DEVELOPING ORGANISATION

Block No. 487

Building No. 29

Adarshnagar,

Worli, Bombay-15.

Place Bombay.

Ref. No. ———

Dated 27th June, 1968.

Sir,

With reference to your letter, dated 13th June 1968, No. 18/2/C-I/58 received by me on 22nd June 1968 and I submit translation of the impugned news-item regarding Father Ferrer in *Maharashtra Times*, dated 3rd May, 1968.

*"2nd May 1968, Manmad.*

On behalf of the Rashtriya Shil Samvardhan Sanstha (The National Character Developing Organization) of Bombay, a request would be made to the Rashtrapati to look into the Father Ferrer affairs and immediately cancel the extension of time limit (granted to him) and confirm (his) deportation. This was disclosed by Shri B. B. Alias, Baba Paranjpe, Chairman (Rashtriya Shil Samvardhan Sanstha).

Shri Paranjpe visited this area on Monday and collected information about the activities of the Father Ferrer. Shri Paranjpe disclosed that he has collected in detailed information about how much money, the Father has paid to some of the members of Parliament whose help he has sought to make strenuous efforts to get (the order of) his deportation cancelled. He further disclosed that he would personally see the President and make a reference to this and request to demand an inquiry into the activities of those members of Parliament."

You will please find from the translation that there is no reference whatsoever in the said news to the extension order which finds place in the translation, supplied to the privilege committee. The information that was given to me was regarding efforts for the cancellation of the deportation order. By no stretch of imagination can

this statement be tagged to any effort, if any, for obtaining extension order. You are fully aware that there is substantial distinction between extension order and order for cancellation of deportation.

I again humbly request you to let me know which privilege of any member of the Parliament is breached by the alleged statement of mine. May I point out at this stage that what was referred to news-item did not form part of, nor had it any bearing, on the business of the Parliament.

If you agree with this submission of mine, I submit that the question of breach of any privilege or dignity of the House does not survive.

However if the privilege committee still thinks that the matter should be proceeded with and if I am fully enlightened as to the *exact nature* of the privilege, I may be permitted to submit my full explanation regarding the notice issued to me.

Awaiting your early reply.

Yours faithfully,  
Sd/- B. B. PARANJPE.

when a privilege motion was brought by some Assembly members concerning the statement of Shri Morarjibhai Desai, Deputy Prime Minister of Bharat, regarding the conduct of some members of the Assembly of Andhra. In that case, that the Speaker was pleased to give a ruling that remarks against some unnamed members was not a matter to be considered by the privilege committee and the privilege motion was not appropriate. In view of that ruling which I submit, commands respect. Even in this matter there is no breach of privilege and so it would be in the fitness of thing that the motion be dropped.

So I cannot disclose any information in respect of any member of the Parliament at this stage.

Then I have not committed any breach of privileges of members of Parliament nor I have lowered them in the public eye, nor have defamed them.

I may add that I have the highest respect for Honourable members of the august body of our Parliament which guides the destiny of our nation.

I am enclosing herewith an appeal to the Honourable Speaker of Parliament regarding the motion of privilege.

Yours faithfully,  
Sd/- B. B. PARANJPE.



ANNEXURE TO APPENDIX V

Bombay.

Ref. No. 127/68

Dated 8th August, 1968.

From

Shri B. B. Paranjpe,  
Bombay.

To

Shri Sanjiva Reddy,  
Honourable Speaker,  
House of Parliament,  
New Delhi.

Respected Sir,

I beg leave to put the following few lines for your favourable and sympathetic consideration.

On 3rd May 1968 *Maharashtra Times* of Bombay published a report regarding my talk with its correspondent at Manmad.

It appears that some Honourable Members of the Parliament took exception to the contents of the news mentioned above and on 7th May 1968 Shri D. N. Patodia (Jalore), M.P. raised the privilege motion in the Parliament complaining against the editor, the publishers and the proprietor of *Maharashtra Times*, Bombay and myself (B. B. Paranjpe).

Your Honour was then pleased to refer that motion to the privileges committee and the matter is now pending before that committee.

In this connection I may be excused and allowed to bring to your Honour's notice that the decision given by the Speaker of the Andhra Legislative Assembly regarding the privilege motion raised by Assembly members of Andhra concerning the remarks made by Honourable Shri Morarji Desai, Deputy Prime Minister of Bharat regarding the conduct of some members of the Andhra Assembly.

According to my lights that ruling is applicable and practically on all fours with the present privilege motion against me. In the

Andhra Motion the Honourable Speaker of Andhra Assembly refused to refer the motion to the privileges committee on the ground that the alleged remarks were not directed against any particular member or members and that remarks of general character should not be the subject matter of a privilege motion.

I, therefore, humbly request your Honour to reconsider and review the order referring the above-mentioned motion to the privilege committee and be pleased to drop the same in view of the ruling given by the Honourable Speaker of Andhra Assembly.

I am enclosing herewith for your perusal a reply which I have sent to Shri M. C. Chawla, Deputy Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat.

Ecl.

One letter addressed  
to Shri M. C. Chawla.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/- B. B. PARANJPE.