

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

SECOND REPORT

(FOURTH LOK SABHA)

(Presented on the 19th July, 1967)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

July, 1967/Asadha, 1889 (Saha)

Price : 35 Paise

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Personnel of the Committee of Privileges	(iii)
2. Report	I
3. Minutes	5
4. Appendix	20

PERSONNEL OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES
(1967-68)

CHAIRMAN

1. Shri R. K. Khadilkar

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendranath Barua
3. Shri Hem Raj
4. Shri J. M. Imam
5. Shri S. M. Joshi
6. Shri Thandavan Kiruttinan
7. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
8. Lt. Col. H.H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah of Tehri Garhwal
9. Shri P. Govinda Menon
10. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
11. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
12. Shri G. L. Nanda
13. Shri P. Ramamurti
14. Shri A. K. Sen
15. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

SECOND REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

(Fourth 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 raised by Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., and referred to the Committee by the House on the 5th June, 1967, against the Editor of the *Hindustan* (Hindi Daily), in respect of the editorial¹ published in its issue dated the 2nd June, 1967.

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 12th June, 1967, the Committee considered the procedure to be followed in dealing with the question of privilege under their consideration. The Committee also decided that, in the first instance, the Editor of the *Hindustan* be asked to state what he might have to say in the matter for the consideration of the Committee.

4. At the second sitting held on the 14th June, 1967, the Committee considered the draft letter to be sent to the Editor of the *Hindustan* and approved it.

5. At the third sitting held on the 22nd June, 1967, the Chairman informed the Committee that he had granted extension of time by ten days to the Editor of the *Hindustan* for submission of his reply, as requested by the latter.

6. At the fourth sitting held on the 5th July, 1967, the Committee considered the letter of apology from the Editor of the *Hindustan* and arrived at their conclusions.

7. At the fifth sitting held on the 12th July, 1967, the Committee considered their draft report and adopted it.

¹ See Appendix I.

II—FACTS OF THE CASE

8. On the 5th June, 1967, Shri Madhu Limaye, M.P., while raising the question of privilege, specifically quoted the following passages from the impugned editorial as being objectionable:—

निराधार, अनर्गल व अनुचित'

[BASELESS, MEANINGLESS AND IMPROPER]

- (i) 'हजारी-रिपोर्ट को असंगत एवं अर्वाचित रूप से माध्यम बना कर जिन निराधार आरोपों के तीर, समस्त लोकतंत्रीय औचित्यों को बेधते हुए, पूरे बारह घंटे तक राज्यसभा में बराबर चलते रहे, सरकार की कसौटी पर वे सारे आरोप तथ्यहीन हैं और सरकार उन पर विचार करना अनावश्यक समझती है ।'

[The baseless charges levelled in Rajya Sabha for full twelve hours using the illogical and undesirable medium of Hazari Report and violating all democratic proprieties, are devoid of facts according to the measuring rod of Government and that Government do not deem it necessary to consider them.]

- (ii) 'किन्तु खेद का प्रसंग है कि कतिपय संसद-सदस्यों ने इस रिपोर्ट को उसके मूल उद्देश्य के बिन्दु से नहीं परखा और केवल वैयक्तिक एवं दलीय प्रचार अथवा एक संस्थान-विशेष एवं व्यक्ति विशेष को बदनाम करने के माध्यम के रूप में ही उसका इस्तेमाल किया ।'

[But it is unfortunate that certain Members of Parliament did not view the Report from its basic objective and rather used it only as a means to seek individual and party publicity or to disrepute a particular establishment and a particular person.]

- (iii) 'ऐसी अर्बैज्ञानिक, अप्रामाणिक एवं दुःसाहसपूर्ण हजारी-रिपोर्ट को आधार बना कर संसद में जो हंगामा खड़ा किया गया और जिस मिशनरी, मसीहाई और धर्मयोद्धा के आवेग एवं आवेग में बिरला-साम्राज्य का भूत पैदा किया गया, इस शौर्य के मूल में जितनी कुटिलता, कायरता एवं कुमति है, उतनी शायद ही आज तक पार्लियामेंट के मंच पर प्रदर्शित हुई होगी ।'

[The uproar created in Parliament based on such unscientific, unauthentic and audacious Hazari Report and the awe that was created against Birla Empire after the fashion of a missionary, crusader and religious zealot, and the crookedness, cowardice and malafide which is at the root of this courage, has perhaps never been exhibited in Parliament ever before.]

- (iv) "संसद का मंच राष्ट्रीय विचार-विनिमय और देश की विविध गतिविधियों को परखने का सर्वोच्च, अंतिम एवं सर्वाधिक दायित्वपूर्ण मंच है। इस मंच से बोलने का अधिकार भी जनता उन्हीं लोक प्रतिनिधियों को देती है जो जनहित को अपनी चेतना में सर्वोच्च महत्व देते हैं और परिपूर्ण राष्ट्रनिष्ठा एवं जिम्मेदारी के साथ अपनी राय पेश करने की पात्रता रखते हैं।"

[The forum of Parliament is the supreme, final and most responsible forum for national discussion and for evaluating varied developments in the country. The right to speak from this forum is bestowed by the people only on those representatives of the people who have public good uppermost in their minds and are capable of expressing their opinion consistent with the fullest national devotion and responsibility.]

- (v) "प्रश्न है कि क्या हजारी-रिपोर्ट का आधार लेकर संसद के मंच से जो अलगलता, विष-वमन, चरित्रहनन एवं अविवेक प्रदर्शित हुआ क्या वह संसद एवं उसके सदस्यों की प्रतिष्ठा के अनुरूप था?"

*[The question is whether the absurdity, venom, character assassination and thoughtlessness which was given vent to on the floor of Parliament by making Hazari Report as the basis therefor was in accordance with the dignity of Parliament and its members?]

- (vi) "इस दृष्टि को पूर्वाग्रह से रंगीन दृष्टि कहें या पक्षपात से पंक्ति दृष्टि अथवा घरफूक तमाशा देखने की लाचारी—क्या कहें कुछ समझ में नहीं आता।"

[Should this view-point be termed as a prejudiced view or should it be termed as a partisan view or again should it be looked upon as a mark of helplessness arising out of setting one's own house on fire—we are at a loss to determine.]

III—FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

9. After careful examination of the contents, tone and tenor of the impugned editorial published in the *Hindustan*, dated the 2nd June, 1967, the Committee are of the view that the said editorial contains reflections on the character and proceedings of the Parliament and on the conduct of its Members as such and tends to bring the Parliament into disrespect and disrepute, which amounts to a breach of privilege and contempt of the House.

10. The Editor of the *Hindustan* has, however, expressed his "deep and unqualified regret for any offence caused to the House or

any honourable member thereof". In his letter² of apology dated the 28th June, 1967, the Editor has stated:—

"May I, at the outset, submit that it was not the intention of the author of the editorial to offer any indignity or odium to the august House. At any rate, without going into any other aspect of the matter, I express my deep and unqualified regret for any offence caused to the House or any hon'ble member thereof. I hope that the Committee as well as the House would accept this expression of regret and would accordingly discharge the notice."

11. The Committee are of the opinion that in view of the unqualified expression of regret by the Editor of the *Hindustan*, no further action need be taken in the matter.

IV—RECOMMENDATION OF THE COMMITTEE

12. The Committee recommend that the expression of regret by the Editor of the *Hindustan* be accepted and no further action be taken by the House in the matter.

NEW DELHI;
The 12th July, 1967.

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

² Hindi version of this letter is reproduced in Appendix II.

MINUTES

I

First Sitting

New Delhi, Monday, the 12th June, 1967.

The Committee sat from 16-00 to 17-00 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendranath Barua
3. Shri Hem Raj
4. Shri J. M. Imam
5. Shri Thandavan Kiruttinan
6. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
7. Lt. Col. H.H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah of Tehri Garhwal
8. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
9. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
10. Shri P. Ramamurti
11. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee considered the procedure to be followed in dealing with the questions of privilege in respect of (i) the editorial published in the *Hindustan* (Hindi Daily) in its issue, dated the 2nd June, 1967 and (ii) * * * * allegedly casting aspersions on Members of Parliament.

3. The Committee decided that, in the first instance, the Editor (Shri Ratan Lal Joshi) of the *Hindustan* and * * * * be asked to state what they might have to say for the consideration of the Committee, by the 21st June, 1967.

**** The omitted portion relates to another case and will be included in the minutes of the relevant report.

4. The Committee decided to meet again to consider the draft letter(s) to be sent to the above named person(s), on Wednesday, the 14th June, 1967 at 16-00 hours.

The Committee then adjourned.

II

Second Sitting

New Delhi, Wednesday, the 14th June, 1967.

The Committee sat from 14-45 to 15-00 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendranath Barua
3. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
4. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
5. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
6. Shri G. L. Nanda
7. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee considered the draft letter(s) to be sent to the Editor of the *Hindustan* and * * * * asking them to state what they might have to say in the matter of the question(s) of privilege against them, and approved them.

The Committee then adjourned.

III

Third Sitting

New Delhi, Thursday, the 22nd June, 1967.

The Committee sat from 16-00 to 17-10 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

*** The omitted portion relates to another case and will be included in the minutes of the relevant report.

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendranath Barua
3. Shri Hem Raj
4. Shri J. M. Imam
5. Shri S. M. Joshi
6. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
7. Lt. Col. H.H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah of Tehri Garhwal
8. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
9. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
10. Shri G. L. Nanda
11. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Chairman informed the Committee that the Editor of the *Hindustan* had made a request for extension of time by 10 days for submission of his reply and he (the Chairman) had granted his request to submit the reply by the 30th June, 1967, at the latest.

* * * *

4. The Committee desired that copies of the relevant debate in Rajya Sabha on the Hazari Report might be made available to the members of the Committee before their next sitting.

5. The Committee authorised the Chairman to fix the date for their next sitting.

The Committee then adjourned.

IV**Fourth Sitting**

New Delhi, Wednesday, the 5th July, 1967.

The Committee sat from 16-00 to 16-30 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

**** Paragraph 3 relates to another case and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant report.

MEMBERS

2. Shri Hem Raj
3. Shri J. M. Imam
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 Anand Narain Mulla
9. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

2. The Committee considered the letter of apology dated the 28th June, 1967 from Shri Ratan Lal Joshi, Editor of the *Hindustan* (Hindi Daily).

The Committee decided to accept the apology tendered by the Editor of the *Hindustan*, and to recommend to the House to take no further action in the matter. The Committee, however, decided that the Editor be asked to furnish the Hindi version of his apology.

3. The Committee decided to meet again on the 12th July, 1967 to consider their Draft Report.

* * * *

The Committee then adjourned.

V

Fifth Sitting

New Delhi, Wednesday, the 12th July, 1967.

The Committee sat from 16-00 to 16-30 hours.

PRESENT

Shri R. K. Khadilkar—*Chairman.*

*** Paragraph 4 relates to another case and will be included in the minutes of the relevant report.

MEMBERS

2. Shri Rajendranath Barua
3. Shri Hem Raj
4. Shri Bal Raj Madhok
5. Lt. Col. H.H. Maharaja Manabendra Shah of Tehri Garhwal
6. Shri H. N. Mukerjee
7. Shri Anand Narain Mulla
8. Shri P. Ramamurti
9. Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

SECRETARIAT

Shri M. C. Chawla—*Deputy Secretary.*

* * * *

3. The Chairman informed the Committee that the Editor of the *Hindustan* had furnished the Hindi version of his apology, as desired by the Committee at their last sitting held on the 5th July, 1967. The Committee perused the Hindi version and accepted it.

4. The Committee then considered their draft Second Report on the question of privilege against the *Hindustan* and adopted it after affirming the position stated in paragraph 9 of the draft Report.

5. The Committee authorised the Chairman and, in his absence, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, to present the Report to the House on the 19th July, 1967.

The Committee then adjourned.

**** Paragraph 2 relates to another case and will be included in the Minutes of the relevant report.

APPENDIX—I

(See para 1 of Report)

हिन्दुस्तान

नई दिल्ली, शुक्रवार, ज्येष्ठ कृष्णा ६, सं० २०२४

[निराधार, अनर्गल व अनुचित]

हजारी-रिपोर्ट में राज्यसभा में हुई बहस का उत्तर देते हुए परसों केन्द्रीय उद्योग मंत्री श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद ने जिन सरकारी निर्णयों को विज्ञप्त किया है वे स्पष्ट करते हैं कि हजारी-रिपोर्ट को असंगत एवं अवांछित रूप से माध्यम बना कर जिन निराधार आरोपों के तौर, समस्त लोकतंत्रीय औचित्यों को बेधते हुए, पूरे बारह घंटों तक राज्यसभा में बराबर चलते रहे, सरकार की कसौटी पर वे सारे आरोप तथ्यहीन हैं और सरकार उन पर विचार करना अनावश्यक समझती है। इतना ही नहीं, उद्योग मंत्री ने बहस के स्तर और उस के अनुचित प्रचारात्मक मोड़ पर खेद भी प्रकट किया है। उन्होंने हजारी-रिपोर्ट तैयार करवाने के उद्देश्य का स्पष्टीकरण करते हुए निम्नान्त शब्दों में बतलाया है कि हजारी-रिपोर्ट किसी औद्योगिक संस्थान-विशेष के व्यवसायिक तौर-तरीकों की जांच का नतीजा नहीं है, वरन प्रचलित औद्योगिक स्थिति का एक अध्ययन मात्र है जिसके प्रकाश में देश के औद्योगिक विकास को और अधिक गतिशील बनाया जा सके। किन्तु खेद का प्रसंग है कि कतिपय संसद-सदस्यों ने इस रिपोर्ट को उसके मूल उद्देश्य के विन्दु से नहीं परखा और केवल वैयक्तिक एवं दलील प्रचार अथवा एक संस्थान-विशेष एवं व्यक्ति विशेष को बदनाम करने के माध्यम के रूप में ही उसका इस्तेमाल किया। इस संदर्भ में यह स्मरणीय है कि स्वयं प्रोफेसर हजारी ने भी अपनी इस रिपोर्ट को अधूरी करार दिया है। रिपोर्ट को तैयार करने में जितनी सामग्री उन्हें प्राप्त हो सकी थी, उसे वे पर्याप्त नहीं मानते हैं।

अपने उत्तर के दौरान उद्योग मंत्री ने सदस्यों की शंका-आशंकाओं एवं काल्पनिक आरोपों का खंडन करते हुए स्पष्ट किया है कि उनकी सरकार के सामने औद्योगिक लाइसेंसों को अनुचित तरीकों से प्राप्त करने एवं इस्तेमाल करने की अभी तक कोई शिकायत पेश नहीं हुई है। इस प्रसंग में श्री फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद ने 1952 में औद्योगिक विकास एवं नियमन कानून के अन्तर्गत बनी उस लाइसेंस जांच-कमेटी का भी जिक्र किया जो जारी किये गये लाइसेंसों के बारे में निरन्तर जांच-पड़ताल किया करती है और जिसके श्री हृदयनाथ कुंजरू कुछ अर्से तक अध्यक्ष रहे हैं तथा मजदूरों के प्रतिनिधि के रूप में श्री डांगे और श्री बसावड़ा भी जिस के सदस्य रहते आये हैं। इस कमेटी ने लाइसेंसों को लेकर आज तक किसी प्रकार के एतराज का इजहार नहीं किया है।

हजारी-रिपोर्ट को बहस का माध्यम बनाने से पूर्व संसद-सदस्यों को स्वयं उक्त रिपोर्ट को सचाई प्रामाणिकता एवं निष्पक्षता की कसौटी पर कस कर देखना चाहिए था। हजारी-रिपोर्ट, जैसा कि स्वयं डा० हजारी ने स्वीकार किया है जिन आंकड़ों का विश्लेषण करती है, व आंकड़े 'आंशिक, अपूर्ण और कुछ मामलों में संदेहपूर्ण' हैं। साथ ही डा० हजारी ने यह भी स्वीकार किया है कि लाइसेंस के लिये किये गये आवेदनों को उन्होंने एक से अधिक बार भी गिन लिया है और दूसरे उन्होंने लाइसेंसों और लाइसेंस के इच्छा-पत्रों के बीच में भी कोई फर्क नहीं किया है। क्या इन सारी स्वीकारोक्तियों के बावजूद हजारी-रिपोर्ट को विश्वसनीय, तर्क-संगत एवं निःसंग माना जा सकता है ?

इस के अनिश्चित बिरला-समूह को कम्पनियों की संख्या, जिन्हें डा० हजारी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट में गणना का आधार बनाया है, एकाधिकार-जांच-आयोग के सुविचारित निष्कर्षों से काफी भिन्न है। एकाधिकार-जांच-आयोग की रिपोर्ट नवम्बर '65 में ही प्रकाशित हो गई थी। इस आयोग के अध्यक्ष सर्वोच्च न्यायालय के एक न्यायाधीश थे। डा० हजारी की रिपोर्ट एकाधिकार-जांच-आयोग की रिपोर्ट के काफी बाद प्रकाशित हुई है। किन्तु डा० हजारी की रिपोर्ट से स्पष्ट है कि उन्होंने एकाधिकार-जांच-आयोग की रिपोर्ट को नहीं पढ़ा। यदि वे एकाधिकार-जांच-आयोग की रिपोर्ट पढ़ते तो यह निश्चित था कि या तो वे अपने तथ्यों को एकाधिकार-जांच-आयोग की रिपोर्ट में अंकित तथ्यों के प्रकाश में शुद्ध करते अथवा यह साबित करते कि एकाधिकार जांच-आयोग की रिपोर्ट में एकत्र तथ्य गलत हैं। दूसरे, यह बात भी समझ में नहीं आती कि एकाधिकार के जिस क्षेत्र का परोक्षण एकाधिकार-जांच-आयोग ने बाकायदा कर लिया था, उस क्षेत्र में डा० हजारी को अपना कौशल आजमाने की क्या जरूरत थी ? क्या योजना-कमीशन की दृष्टि में एकाधिकार-जांच-आयोग की रिपोर्ट असंतोषजनक थी ?

ऐसी अवैज्ञानिक, अप्रामाणिक एवं दुःसाहसपूर्ण हजारी-रिपोर्ट को आधार बना कर संसद में जो हंगामा खड़ा किया गया और जिस मिशनरी, मसीहाई और धर्मयोद्धा के आवेश एवं आवेग में बिरला-साम्राज्य का भूत पैदा किया गया, इस शौर्य के मूल में जितनी कुटिलता कायरता एवं कुमति है, उतनी शायद ही आज तक पार्लमेंट के मंच पर प्रदर्शित हुई होगी।

हजारी-रिपोर्ट अपने तथ्यों में जितनी अधकचरी है, अपनी सिफारिशों में उतनी अव्यावहारिक। इसे उद्योग मंत्री ने भी राज्यसभा के मंच से स्वीकार किया है।

संसद का मंच राष्ट्रीय विचार-विनिमय और देश की विविध गतिविधियों को परखने का सर्वोच्च, अंतिम एवं सर्वाधिक दायित्वपूर्ण मंच है। इस मंच से बोलने का अधिकार भी जन्मा उन्हीं लोक प्रतिनिधियों को देती है जो जनहित को अपनी चेतना में सर्वोच्च महत्व देते हैं और परिपूर्ण राष्ट्र-निष्ठा एवं जिम्मेदारी के साथ अपनी राय पेश करने की पात्रता रखते हैं।

शेन है कि क्या हजारी-रिपोर्ट का आधार लेकर संस के मंच से जो अनर्गलता, विष-बमन, चरित्रहनन एवं भ्रविबेक प्रदर्शित हुआ क्या वह संसद् एवं उसके सदस्यों की प्रतिष्ठा के अनुरूप था ? बुराई की निंदा हो, अपराध को दंडित किया जाए, गलती का सुधार हो—हमारा आग्रह है कि इस कार्य में किसी को नहीं बखशा जाए, किन्तु यह सर्वथा अनुचित एवं अन्यायपूर्ण ही है कि अपराध साबित होने से पूर्व ही किसी को अपराधी मान लिया जाए और उस पर बेलगाम कीचड़ उछाला जाए । खेद है कि हजारी-रिपोर्ट का कतई असंगत प्रसंग लेकर बिरला-परिवार एवं बिरला-संस्थानों की संसद् के दोनों सदनों में जो निन्दा आलोचना हुई है, उसमें सत्तारूढ़ राजनीतिक दल के सदस्यों ने भी अग्रणी भाग लिया है । उन्होंने अपने भ्रविबेक में यह नहीं सोचा कि जिस नीति के निमित्त व देश के जिन उद्योगपतियों की भर्त्सना कर रहे हैं, वह नीति स्वयं उनकी ही सरकार की है और इस प्रकार वे प्रकारान्तर से स्वयं अपनी ही अक्षमता, गफलत एवं अपराध को सरेआम प्रकट कर रहे हैं । प्रसन्नता की बात है कि उद्योगमंत्री ने इस भ्रविबेक को अपने विवेक से परिशुद्ध किया और विज्ञप्त किया कि सरकार की लाइसेंस-नीति और लाइसेंस-प्राप्तकर्ताओं के आचरण दोनों ही संदेहरहित हैं ।

हजारी-रिपोर्ट को अपने 'आक्रमण' का शस्त्र बनाने वाले महानुभावों को उक्त रिपोर्ट में शुरू-से-आखिर तक सिर्फ भूत-ही-भूत नजर आये, रिपोर्ट में स्थान-स्थान पर वर्णित बिरला-परिवार के औद्योगिक कीशल, साहस एवं अद्यवसाय की प्रशंसा उनकी दृष्टि से साफ छूट गयी, इसका रहस्य समझ में नहीं आ रहा है । इस दृष्टि को पूर्वाग्रह से रंगीन दृष्टि कहें या पक्षपात से पंकिल दृष्टि अथवा धरफूक तमाशा देखने को लाचारी—क्या कहें कुछ ममझ में नहीं आता । संतोष की बात यही है कि सरकार ने इस चरमे को अस्वीकार करने का विवेक प्रदर्शित किया ।

(English Translation—Original in Hindi)

HINDUSTAN

New Delhi, Friday, the 2nd June, 1967.

BASELESS, MEANINGLESS AND IMPROPER

The Government decisions announced day before yesterday by Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, the Central Minister of Industrial Development, while winding up the debate in Rajya Sabha on the Hazari Report made it clear that the baseless charges levelled in Rajya Sabha for full twelve hours using the illogical and undesirable medium of Hazari Report and violating all democratic proprieties, are devoid of facts according to the measuring rod of Government and that Government do not deem it necessary to consider them. Not only this, the Minister for Industrial Development also regretted

the standard of debate and undue publicity sought through it. Clarifying the aims of seeking the Hazari Report, he said in unequivocal terms that the said report was not the outcome of the enquiry into the commercial working of some Industrial establishments but merely a study of the current industrial conditions in the light of which the industrial development of the country could be further speeded up. But it is unfortunate that certain Members of Parliament did not view the Report from its basic objective and rather used it only as a means to seek individual and party publicity or to disrepute a particular establishment and a particular person. It may be recalled in this context that Professor Hazari himself has said that the Report is incomplete. He does not consider the material he collected for finalising the report to be adequate.

Challenging the doubts and suspicions and imaginary charges made by the Members, the Minister of Industrial Development made it clear during his reply that no complaint regarding the securing and use of the industrial licences through undue means has so far been received by the Government. In this context Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed also referred to the Licencing Enquiry Committee constituted in 1952 under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act which continuously looks into the licences issued and of which Shri Hridya Nath Kunzru had been Chairman for some time and Shri Dange and Shri Basawada had been the members as labour representatives. The said Committee has so far not raised any objections regarding licences.

Before making Hazari Report the medium of discussion, the Members of Parliament should have tested it from the point of view of truth, authenticity and impartiality. As admitted by Dr. Hazari himself, the data analysed in the Hazari Report are only "partial, incomplete and dubious in some cases." Dr. Hazari has also admitted that he has counted more than once the applications submitted for licences and that he did not make any distinction between licences and letters of intent. The issue is whether despite these admissions the report could be considered reliable, reasonable, and impartial.

Moreover, the number of the companies of the Birla Group, made the basis of assessment in his Report by Dr. Hazari, differs much from the well considered conclusions of the Monopoly Enquiry Commission. The Monopoly Enquiry Commission Report was published in the month of November, 1965. A judge of the Supreme Court was the Chairman of this Commission. Dr. Hazari's Report has been published much later than the Monopoly Enquiry Commission Report. But it is evident from Dr. Hazari's Report that he did not go through the Monopoly Enquiry Commission Report. Had he gone through

the Report of the Monopoly Enquiry Commission, it was certain that either he would have corrected his own data in the light of the data given in the Monopoly Enquiry Commission Report or he would have proved that the data given in the Monopoly Enquiry Commission Report was wrong. Secondly, it is also not understood why Dr. Hazari felt it necessary to test his ability in the sphere of monopoly which had already been properly examined by the Monopoly Enquiry Commission? Was the report of Monopoly Enquiry Commission unsatisfactory in the eyes of the Planning Commission?

The uproar created in Parliament based on such unscientific, unauthentic and audacious Hazari Report and the awe that was created against Birla Empire after the fashion of a missionary, crusader and religious zealot, and the crookedness, cowardice and *malafide* which is at the root of this courage, has perhaps never been exhibited in Parliament ever before.

Hazari Report is as impracticable in regard to its recommendations as it is uncertain about its data. This fact has been admitted by the Minister of Industrial Development also on the floor of Rajya Sabha.

The forum of Parliament is the supreme, final and most responsible forum for national discussion and for evaluating varied developments in the country. The right to speak from this forum is bestowed by the people only on those representatives of the people who have public good uppermost in their minds and are capable of expressing their opinion consistent with the fullest national devotion and responsibility. The question is whether the absurdity, venom, character assassination and thoughtlessness which was given vent to on the floor of Parliament by making Hazari Report as the basis therefor was in accordance with the dignity of Parliament and its Members? Evil should be condemned, crime should be punished, wrong should be corrected. We submit that no one should be spared for such action. But it is wholly improper and unjust that any one should be considered guilty before his guilt is proved and his name sullied in an unrestricted manner. It is regrettable that using an entirely irrelevant occasion of Hazari Report, the members of the Ruling Party also have taken a prominent part in condemning and criticising the Birla Family and Birla concerns in both the Houses of Parliament. In their indiscretion they forgot that the policy for which they are criticising those industrialists, has been framed by their own Government and that in a way they are openly exhibiting their own inefficiency, mistakes and crime. It is a matter of pleasure that the Minister for Industrial Development 'corrected'

this thoughtlessness through his own thoughtfulness and declared that Government's licensing policy as well as the conduct of licencees are beyond any doubt.

The gentlemen who made Hazari Report a tool of their 'attack' saw only devils from beginning to end in the said Report and they clearly ignored the industrial efficiency, enterprise and tenacity of Birlas referred to in the said report at several places. The reason for this is not understood. Should this view-point be termed as a prejudiced view or should it be termed as a partisan view, or again should it be looked upon as a mark of helplessness arising out of setting one's own house on fire—we are at a loss to determine. It is, however, a matter of satisfaction that Government have been discreet in rejecting this biased opinion.

APPENDIX II

(See para 10 of Report)

10-7-67

श्री सेक्रेटरी,
लोक सभा,
पार्लमेंट हाउस,
नई दिल्ली ।

महोदय,

'हिन्दुस्तान' के 2 जून, 1967 के अंक में प्रकाशित अग्रलेख स]उत्पन्न विशेषाधिकार-सम्बन्धी प्रसंग के बारे में आपका 12 जून, 1967 का कृपापत्र मिला ।

प्रारम्भ में ही, मैं यह निवेदन कर देना चाहूंगा कि उक्त अग्रलेख के लेखक की मंशा संसद एवं उसके माननीय सदस्यों का अपमान करने की कतई नहीं थी । तथापि, प्रसंग के विस्तार में गये बगैर, मेरा निवेदन है कि अगर उक्त अग्रलेख से संसद एवं उसके किसी माननीय सदस्य के सम्मान को ठेस पहुंची है तो उसके लिए मैं हार्दिक एवं बिला-शर्त खेद व्यक्त करता हूं ।

मझे आशा है कि विशेषाधिकार-समिति और सदन दोनों ही मेरे द्वारा इस खेद-प्रकाश को स्वीकार करेंगे और तदनुसार मामले की कार्रवाई को यहीं समाप्त कर देंगे । इस निवेदन के साथ, अपने पक्षकी सफाई को मैं फिलहाल यहीं समाप्त कर देने की अनुमति चाहूंगा

भवदीय,

Sd/- रतनलाल जोशी