

MR. SPEAKER: Don't record it. I am not allowing it. We go to the next item—Item No. 2, (A). (*Interruptions*)**

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have already written to you. This is about the hon. Prime Minister's enquiry into Jawaharlal Nehru University affairs. This has now become available and I have already written to you, Sir. Either you allow me now or...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't do anything; I am not under anybody's orders. I will examine it. Please resume your seat.

We now take up the next item.

12.56 hrs.

RULING ON QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST THE FARMER MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS, SHRI CHARAN SINGH

MR. SPEAKER: Sarvashri Vayalar Ravi and K. P. Unnikrishnan had given notices of a question of privilege against Shri Charan Singh, former Minister of Home Affairs in respect of the following news report 'The Times of India' dated the 19th July, 1978:

"Mr. Charan Singh said in a statement: 'Whatever Mr. Unnikrishnan M.P. has said on the floor of Parliament regarding a recent meeting between me and Mr. Bansilal is, to put it moderately, a deliberate and mischievous statement.'"

I called for the comments of Shri Charan Singh. In his letter dated July 25, 1978, Shri Charan Singh has indicated that according to him, the allegations made against him are unfounded and defamatory, and hence his spontaneous reaction to the same was rather sharp. Obviously, he felt

that his political integrity was impugned by that statement, and further the same cast a serious aspersion on the character of his politics. He has further stated that in addition to the statement of Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan, the fact that the Leader of the Opposition did not contradict it had added to the gravity of the charge against him. All these facts were given wide publicity.

Shri Charan Singh has further explained that in view of his illness, he was not in a position to attend the sitting of the House, and consequently he issued the statement in question. He ended the letter by saying that:

"I would, however, like to make it clear that I had no intention of imputing any motive to the Hon'ble Member. But if an impression has been so created, I regret it."

Under the circumstances, I think I will not be justified in according my consent to the motions.

This order should not be taken as a precedent. Any hon. Member aggrieved by any observation in the House should explain his position in the House.

In the result, I withhold my consent to the motions in question.

12.58 hrs.

RE. LAYING OF CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN FORMER MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND THE PRIME MINISTER

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, the question of the correspondence between the former Home Minister and the Prime Minister being laid on the Table of the House or otherwise made available to Members has been raised in the House on several days. I called a meeting of the Leaders of

**Not recorded.

[Mr. Speaker]

Parties and Groups in the House on the 26th July, 1978 at 9-30 A.M. It was decided at that meeting that the correspondence might be made available preliminarily for perusal by Leaders of Parties and Groups in Lok Sabha. The question whether it should be placed on the Table of the House may be considered later. It was also decided that I may discuss the matter with the Chairman, Rajya Sabha, which I have done.

I received copies of the said correspondence from the Prime Minister on the 28th July, 1978, and on the same afternoon, I called a meeting of Leaders of Parties and Groups of Lok Sabha and placed the correspondence before them for their perusal with a request that no publicity should be given to that correspondence.

The Leaders of Opposition Parties and Groups have perused the said correspondence on the 28th July, 1978.

I have received a letter dated the 29th July, 1978 from Shri C. M. Stephen, Leader of the Opposition, requesting

“for hearing the members.... on the demand that the papers be laid on the Table of the House.”

This raises a question of interpretation of the relevant rules, provisions of the Constitution and Parliamentary conventions.

I want to hear the Members on that question.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, before you proceed to that larger question, my submission is that, since this matter was raised in the House, the decision about it should have been conveyed to the House, before the decision taken by you was sought to be implemented.

And, I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a definite affront to the House.

And for that the Hon. Speaker owes an explanation to this House.

13.00 hrs.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Sir, I have a point of order. Just at the time of the beginning of Half-an-hour discussion, I had raised this matter. At that time the hon. Chairman was Mr. D. N. Bosu. I requested him to convey the feelings of the House to you as to how was it that something which was discussed not once but several times throughout last week was ultimately decided at an informal meeting of some Members with you in your Chamber—as you have said in the morning—and suddenly we were told in the evening on Friday that some of us had gone to the Speaker's Committee Room for inspecting the Correspondence. But the point is that something was already being discussed in the House. It was already the property of the House. Then how is it that at the back of the House, this matter was finally decided? Moreover, Sir, if you remember what the hon. Prime Minister had said that Government had no objection to follow the procedure established by the other House. Then objections were raised on the ground that we were independent of what the other House did. We will do what we think is right and they will do what they think is right. In that context, you also said that the House was sovereign and that the Government was collectively responsible to this House alone. Therefore, this House is competent to take an independent decision. After all that, Sir, now what you have done, I do not know. Why and how such a decision was arrived at? That is my preliminary point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Mavalankar appears to have made some observations last Friday evening that I had given an assurance to the House to act in a particular manner....

(Interruptions)