

**Hike in price of filament yarn**

1673. SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state :

(a) whether the prices of filament yarn have been raised as compared to the fair prices recommended by the Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices; and

(b) if so, the factual position thereof and the reasons therefor ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM) : (a) and (b) Since Bureau of Industrial Costs and Prices has not submitted its report, no comparison can be made in the prices of polyester filament yarn.

**Price of Penicillin G**

1674. SHRI MULLAPPALLY RAMACHANDRAN : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state :

(a) the per million megawatt unit (MMU) price of Penicillin G supplied by the Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd (IDPL) and Hindustan Antibiotics Ltd. (HAL) :

(b) the corresponding price of Imported Penicillin G :

(c) whether any suggestions/representations have been received for raising the price of the drug called 6 APA :

(d) if so, the decision taken in this regard;

(e) Whether Government have stopped import of Penicillin G through STC which is the basic drug for 6 APA; and

(f) If so, the reasons therefor ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS IN THE MINIST-

RY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI R.K. JAICHANDRA SINGH) : (a) Indian Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Limited (IDPL) and Hindustan Antibiotics Limited (HAL) are supplying Penicillin G at the Government notified price of Rs. 6.5 lakhs per MMU,

(b) While allowing imports of Penicillin G, price of Rs. 3.5 lakhs per MMU is adopted.

(c) and (d) On the basis of the representations received from Indian Drugs Manufacturers' Association (IDMA) and some other manufacturers, the price of 6 APA has been raised to Rs. 2,000/- per kg. with effect from 3-11-1987.

(e) and (f) State Trading Corpn. of India Limited (STC) looks after the imports of canalised items only and Penicillin G is not a canalised item.

12.00 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE RE. DETENTION OF SHRI V. C. SHUKLA, M.P. BY DELHI POLICE AT LODI COLONY P.S. AND NOT INFORMING THE SPEAKER IMMEDIATELY ABOUT IT.

*(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

Prof. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : I am giving a ruling.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara) : I have given a notice of privilege regarding the arrest of Mr. V.C. Shukla.

MR. SPEAKER : I am giving a ruling.

Prof. MADHU DANDAVATE : Sir, I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : First of all, let me give the ruling.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Yesterday, the 16th November, 1987, at about 3.30 P.M. some honourable Members raised the question of an hon' ble Member of this House, Shri V. C. Shukla having been "arrested and detained" by the Delhi Police. I referred the matter immediately to the government to find out the facts and particularly to ascertain whether the hon'ble Member Shri Shukla was so arrested or detained and if so, why was information in that regard not immediately conveyed to me. I was informed that no arrest or detention of Shri V.C. Shukla had taken place. This information was duly conveyed to the house at about 5.15 P.M. by the Hon'ble Deputy Speaker who was then in the Chair.

Later, last night at 9.30 P.M., I received at my residence a communication from the Station House Officer, Lodi Colony Police Station, informing me that Shri V.C. Shukla, Member of Parliament was detained from 12.30 P.M. till 4.00 P.M.

*(Interruptions)*

This is a very serious matter involving the prestige, rights and privileges of this House and of its Members. The questions that arise are :

- (1) If Shri V.C. Shukla was actually detained at 12.30 P.M. by the Delhi Police why was the Speaker not immediately informed of the detention particularly when the House was in Session and the detention was taking place in Delhi itself and there could hardly be any difficulty in immediate communication ?
- (ii) Why wrong information was given to the Speaker and through him to the House to the effect that Shri Shukla had not been detained while actually he was detained for 3 1/2 hours.

*(Interruptions)*

*[Translation]*

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you not allow me to speak now ? What has gone wrong with you ? Maintain decency at least sometimes.

*[English]*

Since, I was satisfied that there was a *Prima Facie* case needing enquiry, I had already decided to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee when at 10.50 A.M. today morning, I received a communication from the commissioner of Police, Delhi, narrating in detail the sequence of events. According to him, Shri V.C. Shukla actually travelled in his own car to the Police Station in Lodi Colony and "demanded that he too should be detained with his supporters. He continued to sit in SHO's office without any restraint on him throughout the period. Since his supporters were in agitated mood and shouting slogans even in the Police Station, SHO Lodi Colony who by then had returned from the Court did not consider it prudent to let them go immediately and detained them under Delhi Police Act from 12.30 P.M. to 4.00 P.M. Shri Shukla's name was included in the list on his own insistence."

Also, I have since received notices of privilege from Hon'ble Members Sarvashri K. P. Unnikrishnan, Arif Mohammad Khan and Jaipal Reddy. I am convinced that there is a *prima facie* case for enquiry. All aspects of the matter may therefore, be looked into by the Privileges Committee who may make an early inquiry on high priority basis and report to the House.

*[Translation]*

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN (Bahraich) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Home Affairs should resign.

*[English]*

Mr. SPEAKER : There is a second ruling.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : I am on my legs. Please sit down.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Nothing goes on record.

MR. SPEAKER : I am giving a second ruling.

*(Interruptions)*

Mr. Arif Mohammad Khan, I am giving a ruling.

[Translation]

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN : Home Minister should resign. It is a...  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Arif, the words you have used do not behove you.

[English]

You must apologise. This is wrong.  
(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : You should not utter such words. You had also been the Minister of Home Affairs but you cannot use abusive language. It is wrong.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN : The question of using abusive language does not at all arise.

MR. SPEAKER : You have not done a good thing.  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You have not done a good thing. You may please withdraw it.  
(Interruptions)

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN : If saying\*\* is unparliamentary, it may be expunged. I apologise for that.  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Apart from it, you have used another word also. You said two things. It is not good. You may please withdraw them.

[English]

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar) : You deplore his conduct in the house. Every time he is in the habit of doing it. Specially after the matter has been referred to the Privileges Committee, this is what he is saying...

(Interruptions)\*

MR. SPEAKER : Not allowed.  
(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Look, such things are not good.  
(Interruptions)

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN : If saying\*\* is unparliamentary, I am withdrawing it.  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You have said one more word.

SHRI ARIF MOHAMMAD KHAN : May be you have heard so.  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : It has been heard so.  
(Interruptions)

SHRI. ARIF MOHAMMED KHAN : If it is a unparliamentary, I am prepared to apologise ten times.....  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you not resume your seat. I am giving my ruling. You are doing strange things.  
(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I am on my ruling.  
(Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI MANVENDRA SINGH (Mathura) : Action should be taken against the police officers.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Action has been taken. I have already done what I could do. Now you may please resume your seat I have already done what I was to do.

\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

\*Not recorded

[English]

I have already referred it to the Privileges Committee and they will take appropriate action. So simple it is.

(Interruptions)

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down, I am going to give my ruling. It is so strange. Everything has got its limit. You are the hon. Members of the house. Please speak quietly. I shall do what you will dictate. I do what you say. The House is yours or mine ?

(Interruption)

[English]

PROF. K.K. TEWARY : Will you allow me for a minute because you have allowed everybody ?

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER : First I should give the ruling. Did I ever prevent ? I only asked him to apologise and nothing else.

(Interruptions)

12.10 hrs.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
INDIAN RE. EXPRESS CASE

[English]

Mr. SPEAKER : I have received a notice from Prof. Madhu Dandavate seeking to raise, through a point of order, the interpretation of the 'sub-judice' rule. Obviously, his reference is to my observations in the House yesterday regarding the INDIAN EXPRESS case. I had observed that Government had already filed a case in a court of Law and it was for the courts now to pronounce on the merits of the issue. I had also observed that I would not bar any discussion which is under the rules.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the report of the Committee of Presiding Officers (1968) where in it has been pointed out that the test of 'Sub-judice' should be that the matter sought to be raised in

the House is substantially identical with the one on which a court of law has to adjudicate. In such cases, discussion on the matter is postponed till judgement of the court is delivered. In the instant case, the matter is already before the High Court and the issue sought to be raised by the Member is, to my mind, substantially the same on which the court is required to adjudicate.

The Committee had further observed that the rule of 'sub-judice' has application only during the period when the matter is under active consideration of a court of law or courts-martial. That would mean as under :—

- (a) In criminal cases—from the time charge-sheet is filed till judgment is delivered;
- (b) In civil suits— from the time issues are framed till judgment is delivered;
- (c) Injunction petitions—from the time they are admitted till orders are passed.

Since I do not have the full facts of the case before me, the precise nature of proceedings in the High Court will have to be ascertained before I am in a position to give my ruling in the matter.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : One submission to you, Sir. Prof. Sahib,

MR. SPEAKER : If there is anything on this issue, then don't do it.

Then I will take it up later on.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I want only clarification.....  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You come to me and I will give the clarification to you.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Only Clarification, Sir.