

(2) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) under Rule 6 of the General Insurance Business (Nationalisation) Rules, 1973 on the working and affairs of the General Insurance Corporation of India and its subsidiaries for the year ended 31st December, 1974. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1236/77].

(3) A copy of the Gold Control (Licensing of Dealers) Amendment Rules, 1977 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. S.O. 751(E), in Gazette of India dated the 4th November, 1977, under subsection (3) of section 114 of the Gold (Control) Act, 1968. [Placed in Library. See No. LT 1237/77].

(4) A copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 710(E) (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 19th November, 1977, under section 51 of the Finance (No. 2) Act, 1971. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1238/77].

(5) A copy of the Central Excise (Twenty-sixth Amendment) Rules, 1977, (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1587 in Gazette of India dated the 19th November, 1977 under section 38 of the Central Excise and Salt Act, 1944. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1239/77].

(6) A copy each of the Notification Nos. G.S.R. 1588 and 1589 (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 19th November, 1977, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 together with an explanatory memorandum. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1240/77].

(7) A copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) issued under the Central Excise Rules, 1944:—

(i) G.S.R. 713(E), published in Gazette of India dated the 23rd November, 1977 together with an explanatory memorandum.

(ii) G.S.R. 720(E) and 721(E), published in Gazette of India dated the 26th November, 1977 together with an explanatory memorandum.

(iii) G.S.R. 1629 published in Gazette of India dated the 26th November, 1977 together with an explanatory memorandum.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1241/77].

12.03 hrs.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha:—

(i) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 1st December, 1977, agreed without any amendment to the Advocates (Amendment) Bill, 1977, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 28th November, 1977."

(ii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 1st December, 1977 agreed without any amendment to the Smith, Stanistreet and Company Limited (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Bill, 1977, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 28th November 1977."

(iii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on

[Secretary]

the 1st December, 1977, agreed without any amendment to the Indian Iron and Steel Company (Acquisition of Shares, Amendment Bill, 1977 which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 28th November, 1977."

12.05 hrs.

RE. QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): You will recall, Sir, I had given notice of a privilege motion against Shri Charan Singh for having misled the House deliberately by giving wrong information about a date on the question of assault on the Sarvodaya worker at Gandhi Smriti. I had pointed out producing a document, a photostat copy of the order, that it was on 3rd November that he was transferred. But the Home Minister in his statement has said that he was transferred to Library from his post in October in between the first and the second incident, and he based his case on that. Sir, you have conveyed me only this thing that you regret that it is rejected—my notice. No reasons or grounds have been given. I had given a copy even to the Home Minister. If he says that this was a mistake, then *suo motu* on his own, in all honesty to Parliament, he should have corrected that mistake under Direction 115. If he does not do that under Direction 115 and he allows it to be on record, then it is a deliberate misleading. If it is a deliberate misleading, it is a clear case of breach of privilege because the case is made out on that. He says that, in spite of the transfer, this man continued to act as a guide and continued to tell people something about RSS. It is this case the facts show otherwise; the photostat copy of the order, which I have given to you, reads as follows:—

"Shri N. Damodaran Nayyar,
Guide in the Gandhi Smriti Samiti.

is posted in the Library until further orders.

S/d. B. P. Patil,
4-11-77."

So, how could a case be made on the basis that this guide was transferred earlier and yet he continued to work as a guide before November? The second incident was on the 30th October. Therefore, the Home Minister was guilty and I had cited instances from Shakti's Parliamentary Practice to show that any such misleading of the House is a clear breach of privilege. I do not want the Home Minister to be hauled up for a breach of privilege but he must have the courtesy and honesty, in the name of the privilege of the House, to at least come to the House and say 'all right, under Rule 115 it is a mistake: I had mistaken information and I correct that mistake'. Even now if he does that, I will be happy. Let him do so: otherwise it will be a clear breach of privilege. You, at least should uphold justice and see that the House is not misled. Therefore, kindly ask the Home Minister to correct the mistake; otherwise, he will be on record as having misled the House:

MR. SPEAKER: In this matter, the normal convention is that merely the rejection is intimated. But if the Member concerned comes to me, he will be given the reason also. After calling for the comments of the Department and after considering all matters I came to the conclusion that there was no mis-statement. If you had come to me I would have shown you the entire record and it would probably have satisfied you.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I will accompany you to your chamber: kindly satisfy me that there is no mistake.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot guarantee that.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: If you show me the file, I will concede it: otherwise he should agree.