

LOK SABHA

Saturday, August 31, 1974/Bhadra 9,  
1896 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the  
Clock

[MR SPEAKER in the Chair]

RE. QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond  
Harbour): Sir, I had given a privilege  
motion against the Prime Minister....  
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We will take all  
these motions and everything on  
Monday because we decided that  
today we will take up only the regular  
business. We will take up all these  
motions on Monday.

श्री ज्योतिरमोय (बांका) : ऐसा क्यों न  
किया जाये . . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मंडे को रखिये ।

Everything will be taken up on  
Monday. After all, we should stick to  
something. We decided that there will  
be nothing else on Saturday

श्री ज्योतिरमोय : आप मेरी प्रार्थना  
सुनिये फिर जो फैसला करना है करिये ।  
मेरी प्रार्थना थी कि आज हम को अर्ज करने  
दीजिये । आप का फैसला सोमवार को  
हो जायेगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : फैसला नहीं, सभी  
सुनो उन्नी दिन होगा ।

श्री ज्योतिरमोय : इस में ज्यादा समय नहीं  
लगेगा । यह साफ केंस प्रिविलेज का है ।  
कांग्रेस के लोगों ने भी प्रस्ताव दे दिया  
पार्लियामेंटरी प्रोब के लिए और प्रधान मंत्री  
उन को बुला कर डांटती हैं और कहती हैं  
आप अपने प्रस्ताव वापिस लीजिए । (अव्यवधान)  
आप लोग क्यों हल्ला मचाते हैं । हम तो  
आप को जो बोधी नहीं हैं, क्लियर करने के  
लिए तड़प रहे हैं और जो बोधी हैं उन को  
पकड़ना चाहते हैं । (अव्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: I am not taking up  
any motion today. Everything will be  
taken up on Monday, not today. We  
are not taking up anything today,  
except the regular business.

श्री शंकर बयाल सिंह (चतरा) :  
प्रिविलेज मोशन लाने का अधिकार इन्हीं को है  
या हम को भी है । (अव्यवधान)

श्री ज्योतिरमोय : यह तय हुआ था कि  
ध्यान आकर्षण नोटिस आज नहीं आयेगा,  
लेकिन क्या यह भी तय हुआ था कि प्रिविलेज  
मोशन नहीं आयेगा । नेशनल हैराल्ड में जो  
रिपोर्ट आई है (अव्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरी समझ में नहीं  
आता कैसे आयेगा ।

Some Members come and give mo-  
tions. They can withdraw then mo-  
tions. I have told a number of times  
in the House that unless they them-  
selves are under pressure, why should  
others get exercised over it?

श्री ज्योतिरमोय : नेशनल हैराल्ड में  
रिपोर्ट आई है वह आपने भी देखी होगी ।  
प्रधान मंत्री ने इन लोगों को बुला कर कहा है  
कि पार्लियामेंटरी प्रोब नहीं होगी । (अव्यवधान)  
यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण मामला है । इस के सभो

पहनुबी म जाना चाहिए और गहराई में चाहिए यह आप के प्रेजेंटेशन है। (अध्यक्षान) अगर आप लोग एक मिमट देने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं तो हल्का ही होगा।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :**

I am sorry this cannot be a matter of privilege.

कोई मेम्बर आता है, मोशन देता है और वापिस ले लेता है तो उस को इस का हक है।

He has the right Why should you presume that he has been pressurised?

**श्री श्याम नन्दन मिश्र (वेगुसराय)**

आप हम लोगो की वान सुन लीजिये। तब कुछ कहिये। अगर आप शुरू में ही बिना सुने हुए फर्मलेशन दे देगे तो एतराज होता है कि आप अपना दिमाग बचा कर आत है। इसलिए आप हमारी बातो को सुन लीजिये।

**श्री मधु लिमये** इंग्लैंड में कहते हैं।

The King can do no wrong.

इस सेवन का यत्र नियम हो गया है कि इन्दिरा गांधी कोई गलती नहीं कर सकती हैं।

Indira Gandhi can do no wrong!  
(Interruptions)

**MR SPEAKER** When the motions come I have to say whether, on the face of it, it is in order or not. I fail to understand why you should object when a Member withdraws it.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** कल मने नोटिस दिया था, पूरे दिन नहीं पठा और आज नहीं पठा तो हम क्या करें। मैं एक मिमट से अधिक नहीं लूंगा।

**श्री शांकर बयाल सिंह :** मैं दो मिमट से ज्यादा नहीं लूंगा।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** आज तो कोई मोशन देना ही नहीं है।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** एक एक मिमट सुन लेने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं होनी चाहिये।

(अध्यक्षान) काइनेस के लिए हस्ताक्षर करने का आपके ऊपर अभियोग है इसलिए कम से कम आप लोग चुप रहिये। (अध्यक्षान)

**MR SPEAKER:** Today we will not take up any other business. All other motions will be taken up on Monday.

**श्री मधु लिमये :** क्या यह तरीका है इन लोगो का, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। जो काम दो मिमट में हो सकता है उसके लिये 7 मिमट चले गये।

**SHRI JYOTIRMAY BOSSU** On a point of order How can the motion be withdrawn without the concurrence of the House?

**MR SPEAKER** Any member can withdraw at any time before the House is seized of it.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE** Mr Jagannath Mishra, did you sign that application for grant of licence?

**श्री जगन्नाथ मिश्र (मधुवनी)**

आप विषय को समझ नहीं रहे हैं।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** पर्सनल एक्सप्लेनैशन के बाद आप को इस मामले में नहीं पडना यह आप के हिन में है। थोड़ी लज्जा हार्ना चाहिए आप को।

You have given your personal explanation. Now you keep quiet

सदन की मानहानि का प्रश्न अवि-लम्बनीय महत्व का होता है। प्रिविलेज मोशन अजेंट मोशन है। हम कोई माननीय रजुमंया के नीकर नहीं हैं जो वह चाह वही हो। (अध्यक्षान)

**श्री अक्षयनन्दन मिश्र :** चेयर अगर इन तरह से कनाइव करेगी उनके डिस्ट्रबेस पर तो हम झुंजस को नहीं चलने देगे। आप इन को रोकिये।

SHRI J. MATHA GOWDER (Nigiris): Why don't you ask them to sit down?

श्री जयान लम्बन लिख : हम को जो कहना है हम को सुन लीजिये, और इन को जो कहना है किस को भी आप सुन लीजिए। शोरगुल करना चाहते हैं हाउस को नहीं चलने देंगे तो मन्त्रालय अधिकारी ने हमें भी हाउस को नहीं चलने देंगे।

11.14 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down. May I request the hon. members to calm themselves down for some time? I am quite sure that you all have many important things, you are excited about things. But they cannot be settled in this way. Therefore the best thing is to hear you one or two minutes each. You can make your submissions. I will hear from this side of the House also.

There will be no partiality. I will hear this side also. Now, Shri Madhu Limaye

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: On 28th August, 1974, the House discussed my privilege notice....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. We have all seen your motion.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कोई आपण नहीं करना चाहता। कल जो नोटिस दिया है, वही पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि सदप ने नहीं देखा है। मेरे बोलने से इसको तकलीफ होगी, इसलिये लिखित नोटिस ही पढ़ता हूँ।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): It is better that he reads his notice.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Madhu Limaye, kindly sit down. You will have your points of order. This notice of your motion has been circulated to all the Members.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: No. The motion is circulated, not this notice. This is a privilege motion. That is why I am reading it.

On 28th August, 1974 the House discussed my privilege notice against Prof. Chattopadhyaya, Shri L. N. Mishra and 21 alleged signatories to the Memorandum recommending issuance of licences to the Pondicherry parties. After hearing members from both sides, including the Ministers, you ('you' means the Speaker) made the following observations. I quote from the Debate Part II, page 12.10 of 28th August, 1974:—

"It is a very important subject";

"We must apply our mind and settle down some procedures;"

"If people go to the extent of getting forged signatures, we have to go into the matter thoroughly;"

"if the Minister is in possession of certain facts" whether he should not "either ask for information from the member or at least convey to the Speaker";

"I cannot give any off-hand ruling... We will take up this subject again... and consider what procedure to adopt."

यह स्पीकर का श्रीवचन है।

So, Sir, you stressed the gravity of the matter and said that it would be discussed again. I have given a motion. The Congress Members alleged to be involved have also given motions. You have already admitted certain motions.

When the matter is pending in the House, can the Prime Minister seek to pre-empt and bypass the House? This is what she is trying to do. She wants to hush up the whole matter.

यह मुख्य प्वाइंट है।



[Shri Madhu Limaye]

She wants to shield the culprits. She does not desire to clear those who are really innocent. The *National Herald* has published a report to the effect that the Prime Minister advised members against a parliamentary probe and suggested that the CBI should be asked to deal with the matter. The *National Herald*, as everybody knows, is the paper of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister.

This is serious. This is a gross contempt of the House and attempt to pressurise the members of the Congress Party into withdrawing their request for your protection and a parliamentary probe into the whole murky affair. It is also an insult to you and the House.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, 20 सदस्यों ने अपने व्यक्तिगत स्पटीकरण में आप का श्रोग सदन का संरक्षण मांगा है। इस में केवल सी. बी. आई. इन्क्वायरी से नहीं होने वाला है। इतना ही अर्ज करने के लिये मैंने नोटिस दिया। प्रधान मंत्री द्वारा सदन को बाई-पास करने और चर्चा को न होने देने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है। इतना ही मुझे कहना है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will plead with the Members. I just come to the Chair like that. I am not in the know of all these notices. As a matter of fact, when Shri Madhu Limaye was referring to a certain notice he has given, I was under the wrong impression that it was something else because this matter was not brought before me, and as he was reading through the letter I was fumbling with the papers. It is only now that I see your notice. I will request you to appreciate that a man takes a little time to know where he stands when he is in the floods. . . (Interruptions) Now, let us do things in a calm manner and in a meaningful manner.

Shri Goswami.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Would it not be more proper that I also make my complaint about the

breach of privilege and then the other side can be heard?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All right.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Would it not be more proper that I also make my complaint about the breach of privilege and then the other side can be heard?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: All right.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: You will kindly recall that I had earlier given notice of a privilege motion against the hon Minister of Commerce. That is still pending with you. In the meantime a breach of privilege or even contempt of the House has already taken place and I am going to submit to you the grounds on which I think that a contempt of the House or a breach of privilege has occurred. You will also be good enough to recall that 20 Members of Parliament had denied that they had appended their signature to a letter for grants of licence. And in doing so they had also, many of them, made a request to the Chair to appoint a Committee to go into the whole affairs to institute a parliamentary probe into the whole affair. Thereby they thought that the blot that is brought on their reputation could be completely washed of. So that is before you. That is before the entire House. This request publicly made, specifically made, unequivocally made by the Members whose signatures were alleged to be associated with a letter, in connection with grant of licence is before you. Subsequently, many of these members wrote to you that they wanted a probe to be instituted into the matter as expeditiously as possible. Now all that it is before you, you are seized of those letters or Motions. In the meantime we are told them one of those members are now being pressurised to withdraw letters or Motions from you. This is for you to inform us how all this is going on, because, the House has already been told earlier in the presence of all us that they wanted a parlia-

mentary probe to be instituted to this matter. And later the newspapers have reported that they had written to you withdrawing their notices. We would like to know whether these honourable gentlemen had submitted such a request in writing to you or not, and whether the process of withdrawal of letter has not already begun.

The second thing is this. You will recall that there are motions tabled by some other hon'ble Members of the House to institute a parliamentary probe by two hon. Members. There are already two motions on the subject.

And thirdly,—this is the third ground,—now the House is seized of this matter quite clearly and squarely. The Chair was pleased to say that this required a thorough probe and he would go into the matter at a later stage.

So my submission is that the House is fully seized of the matter. This matter is before the House. And in the meantime comes the tidings through newspapers that the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs organised a meeting of the members of his own party to impress upon them the need not to press for the institution of such a probe. That is there. This is contained in the report of the *National Herald* and we also see from the Bulletin that is circulated to us that now the withdrawal of names from admitted motions has taken place. It has been circulated already. Here it is. We are also told, after this meeting with the Hon'ble Minister of Parliamentary Affairs the members met the hon'ble Prime Minister. The hon'ble Prime Minister is reported to have said this—this has been widely circulated in newspapers—in two parts, the first being in a small group of the Members of Parliament who met her and later on at a meeting of her party executive. The hon'ble Prime Minister has expressed a contrary opinion in this matter and that amounts to pressuring and adopting coercive me-

thods, the result of which is already evident in the circular sent to us, namely that some of the members have already begun withdrawing their notices.

My complaint of breach of privilege is against both the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and the hon'ble Prime Minister. They had committed breach of privilege. Both of them are now exercising pressure and coercion in order to get their requests withdrawn from the Speaker, on a matter of which the House is seized. This is my respectful submission.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, on 28th instant, the House discussed my privilege motion in the matter of issuance of licences to seven Pondichery parties. From the debate I see that your considered ruling was that it was a very important matter and we have to go into the matter thoroughly. The Congress Members alleged to have been involved have also given some motions and those are being admitted and the House is seized of the matter. But, a news from the *'National Herald'* which is a paper controlled by Mrs. Indira Gandhi, which is known to everybody has surprised me. It says:—

"August 29—Several members of the Congress Parliamentary Party in the Lok Sabha who are incensed over the forgery of their signatures on a memorandum recommending import licences to some firms, to-day met the Prime Minister, Mrs Indira Gandhi and reiterated their demand for a thorough-going parliamentary inquiry into the affair."

So, Sir, not only that they gave a formal substantive motion for a Parliamentary probe but they also took additional steps to see the Prime Minister so that a thorough Parliamentary probe is instituted. The report reveals:

"Mrs. Gandhi is understood to have told them that a Parliamentary committee would take time to go into



[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

the matter and it would be better to have the matter investigated through the C.B.I. which was already seized of the matter."

We all understand that C.B.I. is a book edition of Mrs. Gandhi. Some Members said that they had been defamed by blatantly false involvement with the memorandum and were anxious that their reputation should be cleared.

Then, Sir, the effect of the Prime Minister's intimidation has produced substantial results, which could be seen from the Bulletin, Part II of 30th August, 1974, Sl. No. 1913, which reads as follows:—

"Withdrawal of names from Admitted Motion.

On 30th August, 1974 Sarvashri Bhola Raut and Ram Shekhar Prasad Singh have withdrawn their names from the motion regarding appointment of Parliamentary Committee to go into Question arising out of replies to Rajya Sabha S.Q. No. 730 of 27th August, 1974, published against S No. 162 in Paragraph No 1900 of Lok Sabha Bulletin—Part II, dated the 29th August, 1974"

If you read the article of *Hindustan Times*, it says:

"Mrs. Gandhi has made it clear openly that the C.B.I. was already looking into the matter and there should not be another parallel Committee to hold an enquiry."

It is clear from this that Mrs. Gandhi has left no stones unturned to intimidate and pressurise the Members of this House who may belong to her party and thereby she has committed a breach of privilege. So, my question to you is this. When a motion is found in order and admitted and put in Part II Bulletin, has the Chair got the powers to *suo-motu* withdraw that without putting them before the House?

is improper and that it was done under the pressure from the Prime Minister which is regrettable.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati): Sir, I have two points to submit before the Chair. What does Rule 225 say? It says:—

"The Speaker, if he gives consent under rule 222 and holds that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order, shall, after the questions and before the list of business is entered upon, call the member concerned, who shall rise in his place, and while asking for leave to raise the question of privilege, make a short statement relevant thereto."

Therefore, under rule 225 a person is entitled to make a statement only if the Speaker gives his consent and holds that this motion is in order.

My submission before you is this. I want a ruling from you. In violation of this Rule 225, that is, even before the Speaker holds matter to be in order and gives his consent, are we permitted to enter into a discussion on the question of privilege? I am particularly drawing your attention to one thing. If you look to the proceedings of this august House for the last few days, you will see that day in and day out, we are spending a lot of time on discussion of privilege, without the consent of the Speaker. Therefore, I think (*Interruptions*). I am asking for a definite ruling on this point.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. He is only asking for my ruling.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI: Therefore, I think that a final ruling on this should be given. I hope you will give your ruling. On, other issue which has been raised, about privilege, I would submit that we, on this side of the House, do not want to shield this issue. We are equally as anxious, perhaps more anxious as the hon. Members on the opposite that the whole thing should come to light.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER May I request hon. Members not to interrupt We have already had enough excitement Mr Banerjee kindly sit down He is on his legs I would like this matter to be disposed of and I do not believe that it can be disposed of by tempers being frayed and by shouting and counter shouting The three individual Members who have given certain notices have made their submissions Let the other side have also an opportunity Let us hear them Why do you intervene?

SHR' DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI Sir we are most concerned because this issue involves not any Member of the Opposition but about 20 Members of this side and we want that their reputation should be cleared The whole question is about a probe Now if the House had decided by this time on a particular type of probe then of course the question would have been different But, this House has not come to the conclusion whether there should be a probe not to speak of what type of probe should be conducted to investigate the whole matter and obviously each party is entitled to have its own opinion whether there should be probe and if so about the type of probe which should be conducted on this particular issue Therefore if the leader of our party has decided that a particular probe by a particular agency may be conducive for the purpose of investigation I do not know how it can be breach of privilege In fact I can assure you that we all will be subject ultimately to the final opinion that this House will express Sir a very serious allegation has been made that the two Members who have asked for withdrawal of their motions submitted under Rule 184 were pressurised These are the two Members who are entitled to—and who can—say whether they are pressurised or not I feel Sir, in this House, each Member is presumed to take decision according to his own judgement and his own free will Pressurisation is a thing which may be known to my friends on the Marxist side On this side of the

House, we members of our party, are never subjected to pressurisation I feel Sir if there has been any breach of privilege, the breach of privilege has been committed by the Members who have alleged pressurisation and not by 'hem

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER I have a note that the Allow me to speak I am not denying anybody anything Why do you want to seize a word out of my mouth? I have a note from the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that he would like to say something on this matter

SHRI HAR' KISHORE SINGH (Pupri) Sir before you call upon the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to say something I would request you to hear us also

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER I will hear you also I am not saying that I won't hear anybody Mr Banerjee why are you so impatient? Learn a little patience from me I am younger than yourself

Now the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has a special responsibility in the matter of the business of the House because he is in charge of the business of the Government and therefore when he wants to say something relating to the business I think he should be given priority We should hear him

(Interruptions)

Order please Let us hear him

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) Sir, I am on a point of order

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Is it your point of order that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is on his legs?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMALAH) Sir, friends opposite have levelled a grave charge that the Prime Minister and myself have pressurised or coerced some Members not to do certain things I would



[Shri K. Raghu Ramaiah]

gation is totally unfounded, incorrect and false. There has never been any coercion or intimidation.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Sir, I rise on a point order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER Let us understand it very clearly. I am in-charge of the House. You are making submissions to me Taking into account the exigencies prevailing in the House I have agreed to listen to you As long as I lend my ears to a particular Member it is out of order for anybody else to intervene You can raise your point of order later. It cannot be a point of order in my listening to a particular Member.

SHRI K RAGHU RAMAIAH. Having said that I would like to refer to the second allegation or insinuation that the Government wants to shield and they do not want to probe into the matter I would like to say here and now most emphatically that the Government is most anxious to go thoroughly into this matter It is not only because honour and prestige of some of our Members is involved but also because it is our duty to find out what really happened and go to the bottom of the matter There is no question of shielding anybody

Further, Sir, as to what transpires between me and the hon Members of my party how does the hon Members opposite expect me to tell them Some of them belong to some Party or the other Don't they discuss between themselves the pros and cons of certain things coming up before the House and a certain policy to be adopted by their party. Many of the leaders of the Opposition meet among themselves every other day and discuss as to what policy they have to adopt in the House If I am put questions as to what transpired between me and my party Members how democracy can function We have every right to discuss between ourselves and there is no question of insinuation.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I had said after hearing Mr. Raghu Ramaiah I will hear you. Let us understand.

I would listen to everybody. Hon. Members have made certain submissions and they have all gone into the record and they will go on record, and it is for me to dispose of this business after that If somebody else says something and then another hon. Member gets up and says that there is a point of order, it becomes a sort of verbal warfare and a sort of free-for-all ..

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE. The point of order is addressed to you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER I am noting down all the points that have been made I am nothing down those points which have been raised by certain hon Members and which require certain rulings from the Chair I have noted down what Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami has said and I have noted down also what Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu has said not relating to the substance of the whole thing but relating to certain procedural matters Therefore, let not hon Members be impatient They will get everything in time

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU This is the first time when at the time a privilege issue is being discussed, we see that the Minister stands up and renders a personal explanation

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER He is going back to the subject again

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU. My point of order is very clear I am saying that a certain method is being adopted which is not in keeping with the rules and practice of the House. Whenever a privilege motion is raised, the Chair has a right to hear the House .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am hearing.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: But you cannot hear that person who is render-



ing a personal explanation in respect of the person against whom the motion has been tabled.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. No, no.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU. My second point is in respect of what Mr. Raghu Ramaiah has said. The Members have of their own free will and choice given a motion, and then they are forced to withdraw it, as we see in Bulletin—part II of today.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. That is no point of order.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU. This is a point of order. This is something which is not proper

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA. My point of order is this I had certainly made certain complaints. I had made specific complaint of the contempt of the House both by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and by the Prime Minister. The hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs was therefore quite in order in coming forward with some explanation in order to enable you to come to certain conclusions. I do not take any objection to that. But I do take objection to his explaining what happened, so far as the hon'ble Prime Minister was concerned. The matter of privilege is an issue which relates to the person concerned. He cannot take vicarious responsibility on behalf of the hon'ble Prime Minister of India and say something to the House under defence. I am taking objection to that.

He has tried to tell us also that it is perfectly open to him and to his party to discuss any issue in the manner in which they like. I do not take objection to that also. They can privately discuss any issue but to give publicity to the views means . . .

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH. But is it an official release by the party?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: It may not be an official release. But

the whole news is published—yes, it may not be an official release—but all the papers are publishing it. They always give publicity to the proceedings of their own executive committee. I take objection to this. My point is that it should not be upheld by the Chair that they could give publicity to their views which they express in their own party meeting and yet ask us not to take notice of them. The moment they give publicity to their views, we are bound to be seized of it in the House.

श्रीरघु लिनचे - मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न सरकार के खिलाफ नहीं था, प्रधान मंत्री के खिलाफ था। इसलिए चरामिया जी सरकार की तरफ से कोई बक्तव्य नहीं देख सकते। प्रधान मंत्री को अपनी सफाई देना चाहिए। दूसरी बात—इन के ऊपर जो दबाव पड़ रहा है उस का नतीजा बुलेटिन में हम लोग देख रहे हैं। मुख्तारों में जा आया है उस का नतीजा इन बुलेटिन नम्बर 2 में देख रहे हैं।

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH. It is quite normal for the Members of a party to discuss important matters with the leaders and whips of the party. I am sure that this is the practice adopted by the Members of the Opposition also, unless it is denied.

SHRI PILOO MODY. We do not perjure

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH. On important questions, we always approach our party leader for discussion and guidance. On this question, I am in a position to deny definitely and categorically that there has been any pressure whatsoever on us to withdraw the motion or to move anything otherwise.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: You stick to your request to the Chair?

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH: Therefore, this imputation is com-

[Shri Hari Kishore Singh]

pletely baseless, unfounded and mischievous.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA**  
What has he said? He has not withdrawn. Does he stick to the request made to you?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER** It is his point of view.

**श्री एस० एम० बाज्जी (कानपुर) :**  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो प्रिविलेज मोशन आया है उस के बारे में मैं अभी अपने विचार नहीं प्रकट करना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि सवाल यह है कि अखबारों में अगर यह निकल चुका है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने उन के ऊपर अमर डाला है और इस बात को अगर वह डिनार्ड करनी ह तो पार्टी फक्शन करती है देश में, यह अखबार में कमेंटिकला, क्या निकला यह हमारी बात है। पार्टी में क्या बातचीत हो रही है इस में हमें कोई सरोकार नहीं है। लेकिन सवाल यह था कि जिन दिन इस सवाल को यहाँ पर उठाया गया, उप-मंत्री जाच साहब ने, चट्टोपाध्याय साहब के न होने की वजह से यहाँ स्पष्टीकरण दिया और उस के बाद नलिन नारायण मिश्र, रेल मंत्री ने भी स्पष्टीकरण दिया, उस में पहले आप ने देखा तकरीबन 19 मेम्बरों ने अपने अपने भाषण दिए और उन्होंने कहा कि उन का कोई हाथ उस में नहीं था, दस्तखत उन के नहीं थे और किसी गलत तरीके से उन के दस्तखत किए गए, तो इन सारी चीजों में दो महिलाओं की प्रतिष्ठा उन की इज्जत का सवाल है— श्री नलिन नारायण मिश्र और श्री डी० पी० चट्टोपाध्याय और 20 मेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट की प्रतिष्ठा का सवाल है। एक मेम्बर पार्लियामेंट जिन्होंने दस्तखत किए हैं वह परार है, ऐबसेट है, मालम नहीं कर पाएंगे। लेकिन उन्होंने तस्लीम किया है कि उन के दस्तखत है तो प्रधान मंत्री सी० वी० आई० की जाच चाहती है या नहीं चाहती है इस का सवाल नहीं है। सवाल यह है कि इस के पहले 19 मेम्बरों को एकमपेल किया गया था,

से उन्हें फोर्स कर के उन से रिजाइन कराया गया था और उन के बारे में मैं समझता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंटरी प्रोब हुआ था, लिहाजा आज तमाम इस प्रवृत्ति को बरकरार रखने के लिए और पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी को जिव्दा रखने के लिए और तमाम मेम्बर एक दूसरे की नजरों में यह है न रह जाए कि जो तमाम करप्शन के खिलाफ बात करते हैं, वे खुद करप्ट हैं, इस चीज की सफाई के लिए पार्लियामेंटरी प्रोब नेसेसरी है। यह प्रिविलेज मोशन है या नहीं है इस का विचार आप करें। लेकिन सवाल इस का है कि इसके लिए रेजोल्यूशन आप है यहाँ पर श्री अटलबिहारी वाजपेयी जी के नाम से या दूसरे सदस्यों के नाम से उस के ऊपर वहम हें नें चाहिए और प्रधानमंत्री अगर महसूस करती है कि सी० वी० आई० की एक्वायरी नेसेसरी है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वह अपने मेम्बरों को साथ करने के लिए और हम तमाम लोगों को कम में कम जनता के सामने फॉर्मिड देने के लिए करप्शन के खिलाफ हम लोग सिर्फ भाषण ही नहीं देते हैं बल्कि खुद भी करप्ट नहीं हैं, इस के लिए प्रधान मंत्री जा को खुद चूड़े हो कर पार्लियामेंटरी प्रोब को बलकम करना चाहिए।

**श्री शंकर बहाल सिंह (चतरा) :** उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था प्रश्न नियम सख्या 31 के अनुसार है। उस में दिया है —

"A list of business for the day shall be prepared by the Secretary-General and a copy thereof shall be made available for the use of every member".

हमारी जो आज की कार्य सूची है उस के अनुसार कामों का सिलसिला सुबह 10 बजे साहब जो सभा पटल पर रखने वाले थे उस के अनुसार होना चाहिए था। लेकिन बीच में प्रिविलेज का सवाल हमारे विरोधी दलों के साथी ले आए। मैं इस सम्बन्ध में एक बात निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। कल इस सदन के सामने एक प्रिविलेज का मामला आया। हमारे



जलसंध के साथी श्री ईश्वर चं.धरती श्री के सम्बन्ध में श्रीर सदन में देखा, हमारे विरोधी भाइयों ने भी देखा कि कितनी उदारता से हम सत्र के उस को सपोर्ट किया कि किमी भी सबस्य की इज्जत पूरे सदन की इज्जत मानी है। तो जिन साधियों के जाली हस्ताक्षर कर के यह जाली काम किया गया है उन के प्रति हमदर्दी होनी चाहिए, उ के प्रति न्याय होना चाहिए, उनके प्रति अपनापन होना चाहिए, सदन की मर्यादा का ध्यान रखना चाहिए, न कि विरोधी दल के साथी यह समझे कि हम इस को राजनीति का एक खिलवाड़ बनाएं। प्रधान मंत्री ने हम से क्या बात की, कांग्रेस एग्जिक्यूटिव पार्टी में हमने क्या बातें की, हम अपने दल में क्या बातें करने हैं उस से उन को क्या लेना देना होता है? हम जो करते हैं उनको ये भी मान ले तो इन का भी भला हो जाए। लेकिन ये उन बातों को नहीं मानते हैं। इसलिए, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हमारे दल की बातों को अलग रखा जाए। सदन की बातें दल की बातों से अलग हुआ करती है और नियम संख्या 31 के अनुसार मैं आप से यह अनुरोध करना चाहता हू कि आज की जो कार्य सूची है उस के अनुसार कार्य होना चाहिए। हमारे पार्लियामेटी अफयर्स के मंत्री के वक्तव्य के बाद आगे और इस बात को बढाने की जरूरत नहीं है।

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पाण्डे (गो.खपुर) :  
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विशेषाधिकार का जो प्रश्न श्री मधु लिमये जी और दूसरे साधियों ने रखा है—यह बात सही है कि सदन के माननीय सदस्य और सदन की मर्यादा का पालन होना चाहिए, लेकिन, मान्यवर, यह बात समझ में नहीं आती—जैसा कि पार्लियामेन्ट्री अफेयर्स मिनिस्टर ने कहा है—पार्टी के अन्दर उसका लीडर उसके मेम्बरों से क्या बात करता है और उसका प्रचार और प्रसार किस ढंग से होता है—यो तो कैबिनेट की मीटिंग के बारे में बिना ब्रीफिंग किये हुए अखबारों में बातें आती हैं, बहुत सी बातें

ऐसी होती हैं जो गलत होती हैं और बाद में उनका ठिमाएल करना पडता है, तो आज सदन में बहुत सी बात ऐसी हो रही हैं जिनको सदन की चर्चा का विषय बनाने की कोशिश की जाती है जबकि सदन से उनका सम्बन्ध नहीं होता है। मैं आप से जानना चाहता हू कि इस प्रकार का प्रयास कहा तक सगत है?

दूसरी बात—यहां हर माननीय सदस्य की यह हक है कि वह प्रस्ताव रखे। अगर वह यह मुनासिब समझता है कि प्रस्ताव रखने के बजाय हमारी मान, मर्यादा या प्रतिष्ठा की रक्षा दूसरे तरीके से हो सकती है तो वह उसको वापस भी ले सकता है। लेकिन माननीय मधु लिमये जी ने जो प्रस्ताव रखा है और जिस तरीके से वे दवाव डाल रहे हैं कि विरोधी पार्टियों के लोग जिन तरह से वे चाहते हैं उस तरह से आप कार्य करें तब ता वे उसको न्याय सगत समझते हैं अन्यथा नहीं। यह नहीं विचारधारा या पद्धति नहीं है। आज दुनिया के अन्दर जितनी भी पार्लियामेन्ट्री सिस्टम की पद्धतिया बनावी गई हैं—चाहे लोक सभा हो या हाउस आफ कामन्स हो, ऐसा कहीं नहीं देखा गया है कि कोई माननीय सदस्य कोई प्रस्ताव रखता है और बाद में यदि उसे वापस लेना चाहता है तो नहीं ले सकता है। मैं समझता हू कि इन दो बातों के ऊपर आप को विचार करना चाहिए और सदन का समय व्यर्थ कामों में बरबाद नहीं होना चाहिए। यह चीज मेदन के ऊपर छोडनी पड़ेगी कि वह क्या निर्णय लेता है। पार्लियामेन्ट्री कमेटी बनाई जाय या दूसरा तरीका निश्चित किया जाय—यह चीज आप और सदन पर निर्भर करती है। माननीय विरोधी दल के लोगों ने जो प्रस्ताव दिये हैं उनका क्या रूप होगा, यह सदन तय करेगा। लेकिन इन समय यह प्रश्न उठाना—या रोज इस तरह से राजनीतिक प्रचार के लिये प्रयत्न करना—विरोधी पार्टियों के लोगों ने एक मुक्ता बना लिया है। किसी न किसी मंत्री या प्र. मंत्री को लेकर रोज प्रचार का माध्यम बनाय—यह देश के

**SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam):** I share the anxiety of the members of the House that this is a very grave matter which should be cleared. I do not agree with Mr. Goswami that we had already wasted some hours. More precious than the time of the House is the prestige and dignity of the members of this House. I also do not think this can be confined to the narrow time House is agitated over it. More and more comments are appearing in the papers. The corridors are getting darker and murkier. Today's *Hindustan Times* says:

"The fact, as it appears now, is that only seven of the 21 signatures are genuine. The other names were appended by the infiltrators of the memorandum and they had perhaps taken for granted that the matter would never come to light while the purpose of the memorandum would be achieved."

I do not know how far this is true, against the categorical denial by certain members on the floor of the House. These things have to be cleared. That is why it has been suggested that a parliamentary probe should be there. The CBI probe is for the convenience of the Government. They can investigate and collect evidence, but no conclusion can be arrived at or decision taken by the CBI by itself, because it is not a governmental matter. It is a matter which concerns the House. More than whether it is a question of forgery of the signature or not, the whole House has been disgraced and discredited in the eyes of the public. So, the basic issue should be gone through by a parliamentary probe.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** It is not a domestic affairs merely because their party members are involved.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** It is a matter of privilege.

**SHRI SEZHIYAN:** In 1951 when a similar case arose the then Prime Minister said that it is a matter concerning the entire House. The same view should be taken now.

**SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu):** My only complaint is that our friends of the opposition parties are trying to read too much between the lines from the report. It would be very unfortunate if motives are attributed to the members either on this side or that side. It is stated that the members who gave notice for a motion were pressurized by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, who is the chief whip of the party, and our leader, the Prime Minister. This allegation is entirely and absolutely incorrect. I was myself present in that meeting.

All the members who were present in that meeting emphasized categorically that no time should be lost in completing the enquiry. *(Interruptions)* It would be very difficult to say which is the agency in this country on which people can rely. I can have one view and Shri Mishra and Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu can have another view about the various agencies. But, ultimately, in a democratic country the real judge of every issue is the people of this country, whether the inquiry is conducted by the CBI or by a parliamentary committee or any other agency. *(Interruptions)* would once again appeal to the friends of the opposition not to spoil the atmosphere in which this inquiry should be held so that the truth may ultimately come out.

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Even if there is a parliamentary probe, the parliamentary committee can employ the agency of the CBI. There is no contradiction between the two. But we cannot agree to anything privately being done by the ruling party when it concerns the dignity and honour of the entire House.

12 00 hrs.

**SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad):** Sir, before I start my



submission, I would like you to rule on one point. Some of my friends of the ruling party during the course of their submission have stated that so much time is being wasted in the House. I want a ruling on this point whether time is spent or wasted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. It is a subjective matter.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Sir, you had pulled me up sometime back, when I was a new-comer, for using that term and I did at once apologize for using that phrase, "wasted"!

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER It is their opinion.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR. To say that time was wasted is not right. Now, Sir, you will recall and the House will recall that earlier this week I was one of the persons who had given notice of privilege motion against the Commerce Minister, Professor Chattopadhyaya. So, let us be clear on this matter that this is not a party issue. It is a matter for the entire House. I do not know why the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs gives us lessons in democracy, when it is a matter for the whole House. If we want lessons about party functioning we will go to him and ask him "how do you function in your party". But here we are not discussing party matters, we are discussing parliamentary matters. Secondly, however big the honourable majority of the ruling party in this House, it is only a part of the whole House and a part can never be the whole, however big the part may be. Therefore, they are mixing up party matters with national matters, party matters with parliamentary matters, party matters with matters concerning the whole country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As a professor you are getting too professorial.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: This is then the difficulty. They are con-

fusing the two. It is against the hon. Prime Minister, who also happens to be not only the leader of the party but also the Leader of the House, that my hon. friend, Shri Madhu Limaye and other friends on the opposition have brought this notice of privilege. If she is very honest, she should have herself come and told this House what transpired between the members of the same party and assured the House that it had nothing to do with the question of parliamentary probe, which is already before the House and which is under the active consideration of the hon. Speaker.

Sir, you will remember that two or three days back, in reply to a very sharp interruption by the hon. Member, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, who said that the Prime Minister had pulled up the Commerce Minister in her room or in her chamber she, got up at once and said "Ji Nahim" and we were happy about it that the matter was cleared that the hon. Commerce Minister was not pulled up by the Prime Minister.

This is a matter which is referring to the Prime Minister herself, as the leader of the House, and not as leader of the party. I do not know why the Prime Minister herself has not come and told this House that whatever happened in the party is not contravening the case pending before the House. Therefore, I would say in conclusion that, unfortunately, this Parliament is taken for granted not only by the Prime Minister but by most of her senior colleagues. They do not take this House and parliamentary matters seriously. If they do so, we would not have had this occasion to discuss this matter.

Lastly, I remember distinctly, I cannot remember the names, but I remember distinctly that at least two members of the ruling Party, in so many words, supported the demand by us for a Parliamentary probe under the Speaker's guidance and by an all party Committee, appointed

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

by him Now they are coming and saying 'CBI inquiry' and all those things I have said in my earlier speech two days ago that the CBI enquiry would not be the right course Why should we depend on a governmental agency to look into the charges? We do not want to get a clearance from a governmental agency we want to get a clearance from a Parliamentary committee because that is the only agency which can go into the whole question thoroughly and independently and that is the only agency in which people will put their faith

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Chattrapuri) The leader of a party has a right to advise the members as to what they should do or what they should not After all, what has the Prime Minister said in the party meeting? Even if she has said that the CBI inquiry is already pending and that there is no point in having a Parliamentary inquiry by a committee of the House There is no breach of privilege It is open to the Opposition to raise it after the CBI has submitted its report After that is brought before the House if the Opposition feels that justice has not been done that truth has not come out then it is open for them to insist on a Parliamentary probe There is no question of privilege involved in this It is the right of the leader of a party to advise the members and every member is bound to follow the advice of the leader

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has almost suggested that since it is an internal party matter the matter cannot come up as a privilege issue Let me submit to you that, as far as the privilege issue the concerned, it transcends all party barriers, it concerns the House as a whole and not merely a party In that case, even the Prime Minister cannot intervene Not only that, somehow or other, the report of her advice to the

members concerned has also appeared in the press. I was telling one of my friends the other day when the members who say that they have not signed this document themselves demanded a probe in this House that was afraid probably at a later stage, the Prime Minister herself put her purple robe on the demand for a Parliamentary probe That was the fear that I had expressed, and that has come true

Another point that I would like to raise is that we are not opposed to CBI inquiries in normal cases But I want to raise a basic issue and in this I am sure I will be sharing the sentiments of many members who made personal explanations here Many of them feel why is it that Members of Parliament should be subjected to a CBI inquiry at all let there be a parliamentary probe When we say this we do not want to have a complete ban on the CBI coming into the picture Even when a Parliamentary probe is instituted technical assistance can be given by the CBI for the Parliamentary probe But the Members of a sovereign Parliament will not submit themselves before the CBI they can submit themselves only before a Parliamentary committee

I will conclude by quoting one precedent from the House of Commons There are many aspects of our Parliamentary behaviour and Parliamentary life—not only privilege but a number of other aspects also—and we are to be guided by important Parliamentary conventions When the Chancellor of the Exchequer Mr Dalton was walking into the House of Commons in the staircase he inadvertently told his journalist friend, "Well today you are smoking today you can do but I do not think tomorrow you can do it so easily" He took a clue from that that probably the excise duty was going up And because of that inadvertent leakage of the budget he appeared before the Cabinet and said, 'I must resign' and he did resign In accordance with that grand tradition,



the Prime Minister herself must resign on this important issue. That is my demand.

कुमारी ज्योतिष पटेल (मावरकाठा) :  
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, दो महिला सदस्याओं ने कहा कि हम ने दम्ब खन नहीं किये। वह काफ़ी परेशान हैं और कहती थी कि हम ने प्रधान मंत्री को भी कहा कि हमारा नाम क्या लिया गया। उन्होंने सी० बी० आई० का भी कह दिया है कि हम ने दम्ब खन नहीं किये, और यह भी कहा है कि जन्मोदन कवायरो हानो चाहिए। सी० बी० आई० का नाम क्या है वह तो करेगी ही, रघुनाथ पालियामट्टो कमेटी पर लोगों का ज्यादा विश्वास होगा जो कि सी० बी० आई० पर नहीं होगा। इसीलिए जो कल तक हुआ है कि पालियामट्टो कमेटी को यह मामला सौंपा जाय वही ठीक चाहिए। और जिन मेम्बरों ने अपना नाम दिया है और अब वह बिना कर्मों के पालियामट्टो कमेटी में से तो उनको जगह हमारे सदस्य रखे जा सकते हैं। इसलिये सी० बी० आई० को यह मामला देना गलत है और पालियामट्टो कमेटी का ही हम मामला को न करना चाहिए, ऐसा मेरी मांग है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER Will you all kindly listen to me quietly?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You are still a professor.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER No I have left that role long ago. The more I see of professors, the more afraid I am of going back . . .

SHRI A. K. M. ISHAQUE (Basirhat) A very correct assessment of professors.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I shall deal with certain procedural matters first.

Certain points of order have been raised by hon. Members. The first is that of Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu in which he said that after a notice of a motion has been given and admitted by the

Speaker, whether it is in order that the Member should withdraw it without the leave of the House? That is the point to be made. I think the practice here is that unless a motion is moved before the House, the Member can withdraw it on his own. Even in the case of questions, very often the Members withdraw their notices or even when the notices are on the order paper, the Member can say, 'I have no desire to put the question.' Therefore, this question does not arise. It is their pleasure and if, in their wisdom, they want to withdraw when there is still time, it is quite in order. (Interruptions) I am dealing with the order of the House.

Now, my good friend, Shri D. C. Goswami has raised another procedural matter. He referred to Rule 225(1) in which he tried to contend that unless the Speaker has given his consent, a question of privilege cannot be raised in the House. I fully agree. But here, we have not reached that stage where the Speaker or I sitting in the Chair have decided to give consent or not.

Before the Speaker gives his consent to the matter which is sought to be raised in the House, he must himself be first satisfied *prima facie* that there is a case. He can do that in his Chamber by calling the members and calling for certain facts and then allow it to be raised in the House. Or, sometimes, because of the atmosphere, the circumstances and the exigencies of the situation, that cannot be done and the members are full of the matter. The other day I had occasion to say that when the members are full of a matter, it is easier to pin a napkin to the mouth of the volcano than to try to stop them. When the members are excited, it is very difficult and now we are at that stage of hearing. The Members have made sufficient submission of their points whether I should give consent to this matter to be raised or not. Therefore that point of order does not arise; it does not hold good.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

My good friend Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra raised an objection that when a notice of a privilege question is raised against a particular person,—and, in this case the Prime Minister is involved—is it in order for the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to reply on her behalf, of what happened or did not happen. Well, I think, we have adopted this convention that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs very often speaks on behalf of the Prime Minister.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Not on privilege matters.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not giving a ruling on it; I am saying about certain conventions and practices and we do this especially in the Business Advisory Committee. The business of the House is often decided by the Speaker in consultation with the Leader of the House but the Leader of the House for all practical purposes is the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs because he comes and speaks presumably after getting the clearance from the Leader of the House.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Then abolish the office of the Leader of the House. What is the need for it?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In a question of privilege, whether this is so or not, is a question that can be looked into and I will not venture any opinion and I will not give a ruling on that.

My another good friend Mr. Shankar Dayal Singh was very technical. He drew my attention to rule 31 and he said that order of the House has been agreed to and it must go on like that. If I had that power of a dictator to see that certain things are done in this House in a particular way, this Chair undoubtedly will be the most convenient place to sit on. You cannot run this House that way when things get hot. So, I think, that point of order can also be disposed of that way.

Now, with regard to the substance of the question, I think it is a much bigger question which cannot be decided offhand. Many of you have made submissions demanding for a parliamentary probe and you also have drawn attention to the notices of motions which are before the Speaker and myself. I have read them. Mr. Mishra has given, Mr. Madhu Limaye has given a very long motion given a series of things...

श्री मधु लिमये : मेने तो कल दोपहर में दिया था ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu also. And among members from the congress two have withdrawn but six other Members are still there whose motions have been admitted. And if my memory does not fail me, when this question came up, sometime early this week, the Speaker had said that we must have a special discussion on this matter. The Table can correct me if I am wrong.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE. He was more or less inclined to that point of view.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I expect this question to come up sometime or other. It is a much larger question than a privilege question. I would only pose certain questions which come out of it for the consideration of the hon. Members. I have no doubt that before coming to the House with anything definite, it will be nice, it will be wise, for the Chair to call the Members and leaders of the House, to discuss this matter, how this thing should be done, naturally, because it is a very complicated question. And I think the Speaker said, he would call them and that some kind of procedure would be evolved, and things like that. Certain questions of course do arise. This is a very important question. And I would go with the Speaker that this is a very important question. I would go with the Speaker that I am also very deeply and personally involved in this matter for the simple reason, of



the accident of my being the Deputy Speaker of this House.

**SHRI JYOTIMOY BOSU:** Parliament functioning effectively and efficiently.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER.** Therefore, when the names of some hon. Members are besmirched because certain things have happened—the whole country is talking about it and everybody and the Press writing about it—if we are not concerned about it, who will be concerned? ... (*Interruptions*). Therefore, I feel that we must refurbish the image of this Parliament, we must restore the confidence of the people in this Parliament. Therefore, we must take this matter very seriously (*Interruptions*).

I am worried about one thing. We very often talk about the privileges of the Members of Parliament. Of course, we should be jealous of our privileges. But, privileges go along with certain duties and certain responsibilities.

**SHRI S. M. BANERJEE:** Why accident, Sir?

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Everything is an accident, as somebody said....

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** Deliberate choice.

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Somebody said, birth is an accident, anything that happens to a person in his life is an accident the only reality to everybody is death. And therefore when the names of the hon. Members are involved, since we are the protectors and custodians of this honour, I for one do think that this matter has to be taken very seriously. I have said privately to many friends; let governments come and go, let anything happen to this country. But as long as the Parliament functions and as long as the people of India have faith in this Parliament, that long the unity of this country and the stability of this country will remain.

**SHRI MADHU LIMAYE:** This is only a method of exposing wrongs committed by the Government.  
2010 LS—2

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** I only pose this question and this will be matter specially for discussion when you meet the Speaker—whether it is in keeping with the privilege, position and dignity of a Member of Parliament when it affects his duty as a Member of Parliament. It does not matter when he does something privately. That is a different matter. But, here, we are concerned with a certain Members of Parliament having exercised or alleged to have exercised their position and done certain things as Members of Parliament, and that is the whole question. When Members of Parliament in the discharge of their duties as Members of Parliament are involved, whether we should abdicate our authority and hand over everything to some other machinery outside the House—this is the question. This is the question which I feel, involves this Parliament and this is a matter which ought to be considered very deeply and would say that this has to be looked into in that light.

श्री मधु लिमये : आज आप हाउस आफ कामन्स के स्पीकर की तरह बोल रहे हैं, जिन्होंने 350 साल पहले राजा को इसी तरह में कहा था, और मैं आप को इसके लिए मुझकरवाद देना चाहता हूँ।

It is a great utterance, a historic utterance!

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:** Having said this, I would leave the whole matter there. After all the Speaker has to decide this question. The Members have made their submissions. All these things are on the record. That will be taken note of and I believe some consensus and some kind of wise decision will be taken.

Now, with your permission, can we get down with the business?

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:** We hail it as a great ruling.

**SHRI JYOTIROMY BOSU:** We are indeed gratified at your ruling.