

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

TENTH REPORT

(THIRD LOK SABHA)

(Presented on the 2nd November, 1966)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

November, 1966
Kartika, 1888 (Saka)

Price : 20 Paise

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Personnel of the Committee of Privileges . . .	(iii)
2. Report	I
3. Minutes	4

PERSONNEL OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES
(1966-67)

CHAIRMAN

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao.

MEMBERS

2. Shri Frank Anthony
3. Shri N. C. Chatterjee
4. Sardar Kapur Singh
5. Shri L. D. Kotoki
6. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
7. Shri V. C. Parashar
8. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
9. Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman
10. Shri Jaganath Rao
11. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
- *12. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
13. Shri Satya Narayan Sinha
14. Shri Sinhasan Singh
15. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

*Nominated on the 3rd August, 1966.

TENTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

(Third Lok Sabha)

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURE

1. 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 against Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., for certain remarks made by him in the House against the Speaker, Lok Sabha on the 24th August, 1966. The matter was referred to the Committee by the Speaker in the House on the 25th August, 1966.

2. The Committee held five sittings.

3. At the first sitting held on the 31st August, 1966, the Committee decided that Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., be asked to appear before the Committee, if he so desired.

4. At the third sitting held on the 6th September, 1966, the Committee examined Shri Madhu Limaye. Shri Madhu Limaye made a statement before the Committee explaining that he had no intention of casting any reflection on the Speaker or attributing partiality to him in his rulings.

5. At the fourth sitting held on the 5th October, 1966, the Committee considered the matter and arrived at their conclusions.

The Committee also authorised the Chairman to make a Report to the House on their behalf.

II. FACTS OF THE CASE

6. On the 24th August, 1966, after the Speaker had withheld his consent to the raising of a question of privilege against the Minister of Home Affairs (Shri G. L. Nanda) for an alleged misleading statement made by him in the House denying a newsreport published in the *Statesman*, dated the 10th August, 1966 regarding the activities of Left Communist Party, Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., made the following remarks (in Hindi):—

“ इसी लिये, अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज मैं मांग करता हूँ कि आप कांग्रेस पार्टी की सदस्यता से इस्तीफा दीजिये । जब तक आप कांग्रेस पार्टी नहीं छोड़ेंगे, इस सदन की शोभा और शान नहीं बनी रह सकती । ”

[For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask you today to resign from the membership of the Congress Party. So long as you do not leave the Congress Party, the dignity and decorum of this House cannot be maintained.]

7. The Speaker, thereupon, observed:—

“These are reflections against the Speaker. I will refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges that they might consider it. That is a clear breach of privilege. There is a reflection against the Speaker.”

When some Members asked the rule under which he had referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges, the Speaker replied that he had done it under Rule 227.

8. When some members raised a point of order regarding the reference of the matter to the Committee of Privileges, the Speaker said that he would consider it.

9. On the 25th August, 1966, the Speaker referred to the remarks made by Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., in the House on the 24th August, 1966, and observed that Shri Madhu Limaye had made those remarks after he (Speaker) had given a ruling which meant that the ruling given by him was partial and that he would not do justice as long as he was a member of the Congress Party. The Speaker added that although he was not a member of the Congress Party, the fact whether he was a member of the Congress Party or not, was not relevant, as the remarks of Shri Limaye attributed partiality to the Speaker and thus cast reflections on the Speaker.

10. Shri Madhu Limaye said that if the Speaker was not a member of the Congress Party, he would withdraw his remarks.

11. After some discussion, the Speaker observed:—

“Now the question which was raised by Mr. Kapur Singh and then again by Mr. Limaye that he withdraws what he said, comes. I do not know what that would mean. It was only a reflection on the House and, therefore, if the House deems it sufficient, I have no objection, I have no particular malice.

But there is one advice that I would give; if he, in specific terms, says that he regrets it, then it might be excused.”

12. Shri Madhu Limaye, however, said that he had no regrets but that he had withdrawn his remarks unconditionally.

13. The Speaker, thereupon, ruled that in that case the matter stood referred to the Committee of Privileges as he had already ruled.

III. FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

14. On the 6th September, 1966, Shri Madhu Limaye made the following statement before the Committee explaining that he had no intention of casting any reflection on the Speaker or attributing partiality to him in his rulings:—

“In raising the demand that I did that day, I had no intention of casting any reflection or aspersion on the Speaker. I also did not question his *bona fides*; nor did I intend to convey that any of his rulings were tainted by partiality. I was merely raising a theoretical issue and I would like to state that I had been agitating this for a pretty long time and it had nothing to do with the discussions or ruling given that day. If it has caused any misunderstanding, I would like to clear it. I would also like the Committee to convey to the Hon. Speaker my highest regards for him and his office.”

15. The Committee are of the opinion that in view of the above statement of Shri Madhu Limaye, no further action be taken in the matter.

16. At their fifth sitting held on the 27th October, 1966, the Committee reconsidered the matter at the request of Shri Jaganath Rao and decided not to revise their earlier decision.

IV. RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

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

S. V. KRISHNAMOORTHY RAO,

NEW DELHI;

The 28th October, 1966.

Chairman,

Committee of Privileges.

MINUTES

I

First Sitting

New Delhi, Wednesday, the 31st August, 1966

The Committee met from 16-00 to 16-45 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri N. C. Chatterjee
3. Sardar Kapur Singh
4. Shri L. D. Kotoki
5. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
6. Shri V. C. Parashar
7. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
8. Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman
9. Shri Jaganath Rao
10. Shri Yuveraj Dutta Singh
11. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
12. Shri Sinhasan Singh
13. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

* * * * *

7. The Committee then considered the question of privilege against Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., for certain remarks made by him in the House on the 24th August, 1966 against the Speaker, Lok Sabha. The Committee decided that Shri Madhu Limaye be asked to appear before the Committee on the 5th September, 1966 at 15-30 hours, if he so desired.

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

****Paragraphs 2 to 6 and 8 and 9 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

III

Third Sitting

New Delhi, Tuesday, the 6th September, 1966.

The Committee met from 15-00 to 16-25 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri L. D. Kotoki
3. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
4. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
5. Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman
6. Shri Jaganath Rao
7. Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha
8. Shri Sinhasan Singh
9. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

WITNESS

Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P.

* * * * *

5. Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., was then called in and examined by the Committee in regard to the question of privilege against him for certain remarks made by him in the House against the Speaker, Lok Sabha.

6. Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., made the following statement before the Committee explaining that he had no intention of casting any reflection on the Speaker or attributing partiality to him in his rulings:—

“In raising the demand that I did that day, I had no intention of casting any reflection or aspersion on the Speaker. I also did not question his *bona fides*; nor did I intend to convey that any of his rulings were tainted by partiality. I was merely raising a theoretical issue and I would like to state that I had

****Paragraphs 2 to 4 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

been agitating this for a pretty long time and it had nothing to do with the discussions or ruling given that day. If it has caused any misunderstanding, I would like to clear it. I would also like the Committee to convey to the Hon. Speaker my highest regards for him and his office."

(The witness then withdrew.)

7. The Committee then decided to consider the matter further on the 5th October, 1966.

The Committee then adjourned.

IV

Fourth Sitting

New Delhi, Wednesday, the 5th October, 1966.

The Committee met from 10-00 to 10-50 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Sardar Kapur Singh
3. Shri L. D. Kotoki
4. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel
5. Shri Jaganath Rao
6. Shri Sinhasan Singh
7. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

* * * * *

3. The Committee then considered the question of privilege against Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., for certain remarks made by him in the House against the Speaker, Lok Sabha on the 24th August, 1966.

The Committee decided to recommend that in view of the statement made by Shri Madhu Limaye before the Committee on the

6th September, 1966, explaining that he had no intention of casting any reflection on the Speaker or attributing partiality to him in his rulings, no further action be taken by the House in the matter.

The Committee authorised the Chairman to make a Report to the House on their behalf. The Committee also authorised the Chairman and in his absence, Shri Sinhasan Singh, to present the Report to the House on the 2nd November, 1966.

* * * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

V

Fifth Sitting

New Delhi, Thursday, the 27th October, 1966.

The Committee met from 11-00 to 11-30 hours.

PRESENT

Shri S. V. Krishnamoorthy Rao—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Sardar Kapur Singh.
3. Shri L. D. Kotaki.
4. Shri Purushottamdas R. Patel.
5. Shri Jaganath Rao.
6. Shri Sumat Prasad.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

* * * * *

4. The Chairman then informed the Committee that he had received a letter from Shri Jaganath Rao, Minister of State in the Department of Parliamentary Affairs and a member of the Committee, urging the Committee to reconsider the decision taken by them at their sitting held on the 5th October, 1966 on the question of privilege against Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P. for certain remarks made by him in the House against the Speaker, Lok Sabha on the 24th August, 1966.

The Committee decided not to revise their decision on the matter taken unanimously at their earlier sitting. Shri Jaganath Rao, however, expressed his dissent.

The Committee then adjourned.

****Paragraphs 2, 4 and 5 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

****Paragraphs 2 and 3 relate to other cases and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant Reports.

© 1966 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

PUBLISHED UNDER RULE 382 OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND CONDUCT OF BUSINESS IN LOK SABHA (FIFTH EDITION) AND PRINTED AT THE TOP SECRET WING OF THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA PRESS, MINTO ROAD, NEW DELHI.
