

(c) the action taken against them?

12.00 hrs.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN): (a) to (c): Facts are being ascertained from the State Government and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Seizure of hoarded paper in Ratlam (M.P.)

3128. SHRI JHARKHANDI RAI:  
Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether under Defence of India Rule hoarded paper worth Rs. 3 lakhs was seized from three firms in Ratlam (Madhya Pradesh); and

(b) if so, the facts and action being taken against the proprietors?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN): (a) and (b). Information is being collected from the State Government and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Power Plants in Delhi

3129. SHRI M. S. SANJIVRAO:

Will the Minister of IRRIGATION AND POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government propose to take over Capital's Power Plants; and

(b) if so, the main features thereof?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI SIDDHESHWAR PRASAD): (a) No such proposal is under consideration.

(b) Does not arise.

# QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO LAY ON THE TABLE BHARGAVA COMMISSION REPORT

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday I sought your permission to raise a privilege issue against the Minister of Agriculture, Shri Subramaniam, for his failure to lay on the Table of this House the report on nationalisation of sugar industry, though this report was submitted to the Government as early as 15th May, 1973.

It is absolutely clear that under section 3(4) of the Commission of Inquiry Act, 1952, it is an obligation on the Government to lay on the Table such reports, not only the report but even the memorandum on the action taken, within six months.

Yesterday, when I raised this issue there was a little controversy raised by Shri Maurya regarding the exact date of presentation of the Report. I shall just place for the consideration of the House three important aspects. One is the ruling given by you in the course of some discussion, which is related to the matter under discussion. Here I am quoting from the proceedings of the Lok Sabha of 16th May, 1973.

"The Minister of Agriculture (Shri F. A. Ahmed): Sir, yesterday the hon. Member, Shri Laxmi Narain Pandeya raised the question of the report of the Sugar Inquiry Committee. I have great pleasure to inform the House that the report of the Committee was submitted to me yesterday and it is under examination."

This was the reply given on the 16th of May, by Shri F. A. Ahmed, the then Minister of Agriculture, now the President of India. That means that this report was presented to the Government on the 15th of May. Again, from the Lok Sabha debates of 26th

November, 1973 you will find that when the same matter was raised under rule 377 by Shri Narasingh Narayan Pandey, he said:

"It is seven months since the Bhargava Commission on sugar nationalisation had submitted its report to the Government but the Government was not in a position to inform the House regarding the various action taken in this regard .... The Minister should come with a statement on sugar policy."

The reply to this was:

"The Minister of State in the Ministry of Agriculture (Prof. Sher Singh): The final report of the Tariff Commission has been received only recently and it is under consideration. As for the Bhargava Commission, an interim report on nationalisation and other issues was received. We asked for certain clarification from the Commission. We have recently received some clarifications. Government is considering that report. The final report is yet to be submitted. It is likely to be submitted by the end of December.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we should have some discussion. By what time will you bring it?

PROF. SHER SINGH: Government is considering the interim report. After Government has considered it, it will be laid on the Table. Then there can be a discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: We need not wait for that. We can confine it earlier also."

Then, I would like to point out one important observation made by you on the 16th May when Shri Madhu Limaye sought the permission of the House to raise the issue. There the question was whether it was the interim report or final report.

On 16th May, Shri Madhu Limaye raised a question of privilege against three Ministers and at that time his 1780 LS-6.

contention was that the Tariff Commission's report was not presented and, therefore, it became the contempt of the House and, therefore, a breach of privilege of the House. On that occasion, the Minister of Commerce, Prof. D. P. Chattopadhyaya gave his unqualified apologies to the House and he said that the distortions in the prices that were created as a result of this delay would be rectified. This was the assurance given. But in spite of the unqualified apology that was given by the Minister, you made certain observations which were very important. You actually passed strictures. When an unqualified apology was given by the Commerce Minister, you said that the matter could end there. But the discussion proceeded. Mr. Madhu Limaye insisted that the matter should be taken up as a privilege issue. At that stage Shri Shyamnandan Mishra intervened and this was what he said:

"May I submit that this deserves, strictures from the Chair because lack of presentation of this particular report has affected vitally the economy of this country."

At that time you made a very important observation and, I think, it will guide all the discussions coming fourth on such subjects. This was what you told Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra:

"If you want strictures, I strongly disapprove of it. The Minister has now expressed his regret. I accept it. But I am not going to tolerate it in future."

You made it very clear, Sir, even when unqualified apologies were offered by the Minister concerned, that even though you were willing to accept the apologies and drop that particular privilege issue, you would not tolerate it in future. You gave this warning to the Ministers that hence forward, in future, you were not going to tolerate it. Shri F. A. Ahmed has made it

clear that the report was submitted; he has accepted it; he is a man of great integrity....

MR. SPEAKER: When so many things happen on this side, there also I have said that I would not tolerate it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I will conclude by referring to what Mr. Maurya said yesterday. He said that it was only an interim report. The same thing was said by Prof. Sher Singh and in spite of that, from what I see from the Lok Sabha debate, you made it clear that though it might be an interim report, we might confine ourselves to it, there might be a discussion, and you wanted it to be laid on the Table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: There are no observations from me about the interim report.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: There is one more point about this. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee rightly pointed out yesterday that, as far as the Third Pay Commission's report was concerned, though the Government had not applied its mind, though they had not considered the recommendations, though the line of action was not at all finalised, even then as required by this House the Third Pay Commission's report was laid on the Table of the House.

As I submitted, you rightly pointed out last time when Prof. Sher Singh wanted some time for considering: "We need not wait for that; let it come for discussion earlier and let us confine ourselves to it." 'Earlier' means 'earlier report'...

MR. SPEAKER: I meant to say discussion earlier than that. Do not add your own words to it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Therefore, Sir, whatever has been placed before you is sufficient to bring out a clear case of privilege. I have tried to reply to every point that Mr. Maurya raised yesterday, and in writing I have furnished the information

about all these rulings from the past debates. There is thus a clear case of breach of privilege and I may be permitted to raise this issue.

On one occasion you had said that it was an impropriety. Let us evolve a mathematical formula as to how many improprieties constitute one case of breach of privilege. If there are improprieties three times, let us have a formula, that three improprieties would mean a breach of privilege. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Only the Minister. I am not allowing any one. The Minister may give us the information about the date of presentation of the report.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM): There seems to be some confusion here about the year. I am reading out from the hon. Members notice:

"I had raised a privilege issue against Shri C. Subramaniam on August 20, 1974, for his failure to place the Bhargava Commission Report concerning nationalisation of sugar industry before the Parliament though the report was submitted to the Government as early as May 15, 1974."

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That is your typist's mistake. In my copy, it is 1973.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I thought only the Ministers committed mistakes. But here even hon. members do commit mistakes with regard to year.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: In the original copy there is no mistake.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Mr. Speaker, Sir, do you allow the debate to be belittled in this manner? His deputy probably did not report to him properly. That is his department's fault. Why should

he be allowed to belittle the significance of the discussion in the House in this manner? Is it a matter of great intelligence to cash in on that? Our time is being wasted in such petty matters. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I want to know from the Minister the dates.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: When the final report was submitted is the first question.

The final report was submitted on 27th February 1974. The interim report was submitted in May 1973. He said about some breach having been committed under the Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1952. Now, I submit that it relates to the final report and not to any interim report whatsoever. Therefore, I have not committed any breach of privilege with reference to the provisions of the Commissions of Enquiry Act, because the final report was submitted only in February 1974. He raised the other point about ruling by you, that the ruling is disobeyed etc. I have gone through the proceedings and I do not find any such ruling, as far as I could understand it. If you feel that there was a ruling by you directing the Government to have a discussion whatever the thing, I am very sorry for it, but that is not a question of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: That was about whether we can have discussion even earlier than the submission of the interim report. Don't put it like that, as Mr. Dandavate has put it.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: If it is a question of your direction being disobeyed, that is not the case, we have submitted our position and we have also to take this aspect into account that since the final report has already been submitted and it is in the hands of the Government and Government are considering it, is it necessary that we should merely bring the interim report for consideration, even though

we have got the final report, which we are still considering. It would have been premature after having received the final report to bring only the interim report and have a discussion on that here. So far as the final report is concern, we are considering it and I wish to assure you, before 27th August we will try to place the Report on the Table of the House.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): My point of order is this. He said about interim report and final report. He can possibly and legitimately submit a report on the floor of the House before six months are completed that is, upto 27th of this month. I concede that point. But what I wish to submit is that this so-called interim report is not an interim report at all. This Bhargava Commission was appointed and they had these special terms of reference whether nationalisation should be there or not. It is the only report regarding the nationalisation of the sugar factories and I request that that report must be placed on the Table of the House. My hon. friend Mr. N. N. Pandey from the ruling party will bear me out when I say this, although he belongs to the ruling party, he would agree with me, this report is not an interim report at all, but is the only report regarding nationalisation. So, this is my submission, Sir, and I request that this report should be laid on the Table of the House.

श्री नरसिंह नारयण पांडे: (गोरखपुर)  
मैं समझता हूँ कि यह इम्प्रोप्राइट्टी का सवाल है प्रिविलेज का सवाल नहीं है। फॅक्ट यह है कि प्रो शेर सिंह ने एक पत्र भारतीय कमिशन को लिखा था और इस बारे में लिखा था कि वह यूगर इंडस्ट्री के नैशनलाइजेशन के ऊपर अपनी रिपोर्ट तत्काल पेश करें। उस बसिस पर भारतीय कमिशन ने एक रिपोर्ट पेश की। इसको भी फॅक्टरीन प्रली ग्रहमदने 15 मई को स्वीकार भी किया

था। आज यह कहना कि वह इंटेरिम रिपोर्ट है ठीक नहीं है। रिपोर्ट के दो गहू हैं। एक तो शूगर इंडस्ट्री के नेशनलाइजेशन का इसू है जिस पर गवर्नमेंट ने सदन के दबाव में आकर और अपने पत्र के तहत रिपोर्ट मांगी गई और वह पेश हुई। उस रिपोर्ट पर फोरन विचार होना चाहिये उसको फोरम पेश किया जाना चाहिये ताकि यह सदन उस पर विचार कर सके और आप भी किसी निश्चय पर पहुंच सकें और सदन भी किसी निश्चय पर पहुंच सके।

दूसरा भाग जो है वह कैन डिबेलेपमेंट और एनाइड सवजटम से ताल्लुक रखता है। जिस को आज से कमिन्स रिपोर्ट कहते हैं उसमें पहले भी एक रिपोर्ट अक्टूबर में सचमुच आ चुका है। वह इंटेरिम रिपोर्ट थी। ऐंजुयली आज यह कहना कि यह रिपोर्ट इंटेरिम रिपोर्ट है सरासर गलत है।

रिपोर्ट को इनको यहा पेश करना चाहिये उस पर यहा बहस होनी चाहिये। मैमोरंडम भी आपको पेश करना चाहिये। गवर्नमेंट ने क्या ऐक्शन लिया है इसका पता चलना चाहिये। हमारी कमिटमेंट है सदन की कमिटमेंट है कांग्रेस पार्टी की कमिटमेंट है और यह पूरी होनी चाहिये। मैं प्रिवेज ओशन का विरोध करना हूँ लेकिन यह कहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय को जल्दी से जल्दी मौका सदन को देना चाहिये उस पर विचार करने का और सरकार को उस पर जो उसका मैमोरंडम है वह पेश करना चाहिये।

श्री म. गुलाम (बाका) अकसर यह होता है कि टैरिफ कमिशन हो या कमिशन आफ इन्फ्लेक्शन। ऐक्ट के तहत कमिशन हो उनको दो या तीन विषय दिये जाते हैं। जैसे टैरिफ कमिशन का रेशन है स्टेपल है, फाइलिंग फिनेमेंट यानि है और वह सदन पर अलग अलग र.पोटेंदेता है। उसका यह मतलब नहीं है कि यह इंटेरिम रिपोर्ट है। वह अपने में से कटेड रिपोर्ट होता है। इसलिए मेरा यह कहना है कि अपना निर्णय देने से पहले

आप रिपोर्ट को पेश देख लें और देखने के बाद यदि आप की यह राय होगी कि यह इंटेरिम रिपोर्ट है और सैल्फ कटेड नहीं है तो आप उसकी मानियें। लेकिन अगर आप इस मतीजे पर पहुंचें कि वह अपने में सैल्फ कटेड रिपोर्ट है तो आप उसके मुताबिक निर्णय दें। इंटेरिम का मतलब यह होता है कि वह तात्कालिक है और बाद में अंतिम सुझाव, फाइनल सुझाव इसके बारे में आ रहे हैं। अगर यह सैल्फ कटेड रिपोर्ट है तो आपको विशेषाधिकार भंग के बारे में फैसला करना चाहिये। लेकिन यह केवल अनौचित्य का सवाल नहीं है पांडे जी से मैं विलकुल अलग राय रखता हूँ। मंत्री महोदय को एक घंटे से माफी मांगने की अवसर है। यह कोई नई बात नहीं है। माफी मांगने से सवाल हल होने वाला नहीं है। बारबार सदन का अपमान करना यह विशेषाधिकार का तथा सदन की मानहानि का सवाल बन जाता है। इसलिये आप इन दोनों रिपोर्टों को देख लें और स्वयं नतीजे पर पहुंचें।

श्री गेंदा सिंह (बदरौमा) रिपोर्ट का अगर ठीक से देखा जाए तो उससे देश के एक बहुत बड़े हिस्से का भाग्य बदलने वाला है। यह मसला जो अभी पेश हुआ है और प्रिविलेज की शक्ल में आपके सामने आया है उसको ले कर मैं दो दलों को विभक्त नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ कि उस तरफ तथा इस तरफ बैठने वालों में से बहुत भारी बहुमत होगा जो शूगर इंडस्ट्री की आज को उत्तर प्रदेश में और बिहार में सड़ी हुई हालत है उस पर असंतुष्ट होगा और कहता होगा कि उसका नेशनलाइजेशन किया जाए, उसको पब्लिक सैक्टर में लाया जाय। हमें चाहिये कि हम इस प्रश्न पर अपनी बुद्धिमत्ता तथा अपनी अकल को लगाएँ और देखें कि कितनी इस क्षेत्र में हम मदद कर सकते हैं। मैं मधु बड़वते जी, लिये जी और मिश्र जी सबको प्रीस करता हूँ कि वे कोशिश करें कि शूगर नेशनलाइजेशन पर मुल्क में एक फैसला हो जाए यह बहुत असानी से हो सकता है। हमने तो



बम्बई में ही 1969 में बहुत भारी बहुमत के साथ फैसला किया था अपनी पार्टी में और एक प्रस्ताव भी पास किया था जिस को रखने वाले थे श्री कमला पति जी त्रिपाठी और आज के मुख्य मंत्री श्री बहुगुणा जी। मैं समझता हूँ कि यही एक सब से बड़ा प्रश्न है और इस प्रश्न पर हम बैठ करके अपनी बुद्धि लगाए। श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम ने शूगर मिल एसोशियसन की बैठक में जो भाषण किया उससे मुझे बड़ी खुशी हुई और मैं समझता हूँ कि श्री मधु दंडवते को भी खुशी हुई होगी अगर उन्हें उस भाषण को पढ़ा होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि श्री दंडवते इस देरी वाली बात को भूला देगे। देर हुई है इस पर कोई शक नहीं है। 1969 में यह प्रस्ताव पास हुआ था और आज 1974 है। पांच बरस हो गए हैं। अगर आज भी किसानों का उद्धार करने का मौका मिल जाए तो यह देर वाली छोटी बात होगी। रिपोर्ट आ चुकी है। अब हमें बैठ कर इस पर फैसला करना है। ये जो शूगर मिल्स खराब हालत में हैं पुरानी पड़ गई हैं और जिन हाथों में ये हैं इनको उन हाथों में रख कर मैं समझता हूँ कि उन लोगों ने मुल्क से भीख मंगवाई है मुल्क के किसानों से भीख मंगवाई है। इन्होंने मिनो का सदा शोषण किया है। उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में इतनी बड़ी आबादी होते हुए भी दोनों सूबे आज भी पिछड़े हैं वहाँ के किसानों की हालत शोचनीय। न जाने इस महत्वपूर्ण मसले पर हम सब को विचार करना है। श्री लिमये और श्रीमधु दंडवते हमारे नेता रहे हैं

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** अब भी हैं।

**श्री वेदा सिंह :** अब तो इंदिरा जी हैं। हम राजनीतिक क्षेत्र में सब हैं और हमारी नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी हैं और उन से ही हम सबक लेते हैं। श्री मिश्र भी हमारा साथ रहे हैं। इन्होंने भी यही कहा था। आज य कैसे बयानें झांक सकते हैं। इन्होंने हमारा साथ बैठ कर कहा था कि शूगर मिल्स को निजी तः से बहार करो और पब्लिक सैक्टर में इन

को ल आओ। आप इस बात का फैसला करिए दंडवत आप हमारी बात बोड़ी देर के लिए मान जाएं आपकी बड़ी कृपा होगी। प्रिविलेज की बात छोड़ कर आप अपनी सारी शक्ति, बुद्धि और ताकत इस बात में लगा दें कि शूगर फैक्टरीज पब्लिक सैक्टर में हों।

**SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:**  
I quite agree that the issue of nationalisation of sugar industry should not be lost in any controversy that is raging over the issue of privilege. But, to my mind the two things stand out clearly and they are sought to be smudged by the other side. The first issue is this: this House has persistently asked a question whether the report on sugar nationalisation had been submitted and if it had been, whether it was going to be presented to the House and discussed. That was the question persistently asked in this House. Then at one stage the then Agriculture Minister had told the House that the report had been submitted. It was very clear and categorical statement and, I think, it was a true statement that the report on sugar nationalisation had been submitted on the 15th May, 1973.

Later there were prevarications and misrepresentations so that some kind of a difference could be made between the report on sugar industry as such and the report on sugar nationalisation. But this House had never asked for the report on sugar industry as such. It had asked a specific question whether the report on sugar nationalisation had been submitted, and the reply given was it had been submitted on the 15th May, 1973.

So, the issue of privilege relates to the specific issue of the submission of the report on sugar nationalisation. And it has now been clearly established that there is only one report on sugar nationalisation. If that is the only report, then why since May, 1973, there have been prevarications and misrepresentations amounting to a breach of privilege. Since you have

given a clear ruling that you wanted a discussion to take place on this without further delay and procrastination and since delay and procrastination has occurred, there is another issue of the flouting of the decision of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Let not the hon. Member quote me just as it suits him or somebody else.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: If we are quoting you wrongly, then you can object....

MR. SPEAKER: He said that they were considering it and we could have a discussion. I said that we need not wait for that but we could have it earlier than that also.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: That is still better. But the issue is this. Considering the importance and urgency of the subject which everyone in this House shares including the other side of the House, the question was asked whether the report on sugar nationalisation had been presented. The then Agriculture Minister did say that it had been presented, but we have been denied of the submission of that report during all these months, nearly a year or even more, and the discussion has not taken place.

So, there has been a clear breach of privilege and the only candid thing that the Government can do is to confess that there has been a breach of privilege and express regret about it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: May I make just a submission before you give your ruling so that you can clear that point also? Ultimately, the whole controversy boils down to this whether what was submitted on the 15th May, 1973 was an interim report or not. If you look at the terms of reference, they prepared specifically a report on one specific issue on sugar nationalisation, and if they were to submit it in two parts and tell the Government that as far as the issue of nationalisation of the sugar indus-

try was concerned they were giving the first report in which they were giving the findings on the basis of certain evidence that they had gathered and still they had not come to any final conclusion, they would have said so. Unofficially, this report has already seen the light of the press, and if you go through the press reports you will find that even the conclusions have been given, and I had quoted them yesterday, and in fact, even the break-up has been given. Some members say that a sugar authority should be created; others say that there should be total nationalisation. But as far as the structure to be built up is concerned, it should be taken away from the private sector; that has been made explicitly clear.

Since the final conclusions were arrived at, there is no question of this report being an interim report. It is a self-contained final report on nationalisation and, therefore, it ought to have come before us.

In conclusion, I would draw your attention to the phrase 'report, if any' in section 3 of the Act. It does not talk about interim and final reports. It only refers to 'report, if any'. That means, that any report that has been presented has to come before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: It did come out. But let the hon. Members not make everything a matter of debate here every day.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): The whole controversy boils down to this, whether the earlier report is an interim report or not. The Ministers take shelter behind this plea that it is an interim report and therefore, he was not bound to place it on the Table of the House. This matter cannot be discussed here in a dispassionate manner. So, it should better be referred to the Privileges Committee where all aspects could be discussed and light thrown on the matter.

श्री भगवान् राव जॉशी (शाजापुर) :  
मन्त्री महोदय ने जो खुलाशा दिया उस के बारे में पाइय जी ने जो बात नहीं है उस को देख कर इस मामले की जांच होना बहुत आवश्यक हो जाता है क्योंकि बार बार इस सदन में इस बात की मांग हो चुकी कि चर्चा उद्योग के राष्ट्रियकरण के बारे में जो भी प्रतिवेदन आए हैं उनको सदन की टबल पर क्यों नहीं रखा जाता ? उस के बारे में जो मन्त्री महोदय ने पहले दस्तव्य दिया था उस में 15 मई की बात नहीं गई थी, उस को नहीं रखा गया, उस के बाद मुद्रहणम साहब अब खड़े हो कर रहे थे कि वह रिपोर्ट 27 फरवरी को आई है और अगली 6 महीने नहीं हुए कि तु जिस बात का वह हवाला देते हैं कि अंतरिम रिपोर्ट है क्या यह बात सही है कि राष्ट्रियकरण के बारे में रिपोर्ट जिस को भिजा गया था प्रतिवेदन देने के लिए क्या वह सही है या कोई प्रयोग है जब तक इसका खुलासा नहीं होता तब तक यह कौन जांच करेगा ? इसलिए विषयाधिकार समिति इस को पूर्ण जांच कर सकती है और इस मामले को प्रजावाधिकार समिति को भज दिया जाए ।

SHRI G. SUBRAMANIAM: There is one clarification to be made. This is what the Bhargava Commission have said while forwarding the Report:

"I have great pleasure in presenting the Report of the Sugar Inquiry Commission. It includes the two Interim Reports of the Commission as Parts I and II of the Report...."

So the Commission themselves have taken those two Reports as Interim Reports as Parts I and II and they are submitting their report along with that.

Therefore, the Report as in the Act refers only to this final report which has been submitted on February 27, 1974. This is in the letter of the Commission itself.

MR. SPEAKER: I would tell Prof. Dandavate that as I understand it, the

Report of the Commission is in three parts. You quoted me, but I do not think you properly interpreted it. When Prof. Sher Singh said 'we are examining the Interim Report', I said we can have a discussion even earlier than that. I did not say interim report. I gave the ruling: you keep on considering it; we can have a discussion earlier than that.

The whole position boils down to this. The report is presented thrice—once, twice, thrice. I have to judge when is the final act of presentation to be counted, from the first one, the second one or the third one. Or have I to divide the privilege into one-third, one-third, one-third?

I think in the case of interim reports when they are part of the final report, the final presentation counts. The Report should be counted from the date of its final presentation. The Minister has quoted the Commission itself to say that these two were two interim reports and included in the final report. It is very clear. I do not divide the privilege into one-third, one-third and one-third. I have to take it from the last date when it was finally presented.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Before you conclude your ruling, I want only to make one submission. This ruling will ultimately guide all the future decisions. Even after what Shri Subramaniam has quoted saying that they have sent Parts I and II and in that sense these are interim reports, even then Parts I and II are self-contained reports on specific issues submitted. So, though technically he may describe them as interim reports, it is a self-contained report and the issue is closed with it. They are not going to touch on this question of nationalisation in any further report. So as far as that is concerned, the issue is closed.

MR. SPEAKER: Which is the final report and when was it presented?

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE (Banka): The so-called Interim report is self-contained!



MR. SPEAKER: From which date is the presentation to be counted? I am not going to count the date of presentation from the first interim report. Do we count the presentation under three heads? We have to take the presentation from the last date.

I am sorry I cannot admit the privilege motion.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Before you give the ruling, kindly go into the Report.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): The issue is not decided in the final report. Every issue cannot be decided in the final report....

MR. SPEAKER: I am a little surprised. This implies that the privilege should be divisible. I cannot divide the privilege. The report is the report which is finally presented.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: What is final?

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot go into that.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Do you disbelieve the statement of Shri F. A. Ahmed, the then Agriculture Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I do not disbelieve any party or anybody. I do not disbelieve anybody, inside or outside the House. My point is, from where do I count the date of presentation. You say, it is a privilege. But, he says it is the final act of presentation which should be taken into account. He has quoted to this effect. The report is final including the two interim reports. I cannot agree with you.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, kindly go through the report and see whether it is a self-contained report.

MR. SPEAKER: The report comes in three parts. How can I say this constitutes a privilege issue? If they had said, there were two earlier reports, it is all right. But, they did not say like that.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Sir, on a point of order,

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order now please.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, kindly go through the report. You decide whether it is self-contained or not. This is my request. Let us not hustle through the matter.

श्री मधु लिमये : कानून मंत्री श्री गोखले के बारे में मैंने जो विश्वाधिकार का सवाल दिया है — मैंने दोनों बयान आपको दिये हैं उनका क्या हुआ ?

MR. SPEAKER: I am waiting for that. I will let you know. Yesterday, you kept me quite busy. I had hardly any time for lunch and I had to come back for two meetings here. I left after all of you had gone. I frankly admit, I could not find any time for it. Give me some time to find it out.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, ब्रिटेन के प्रधान मंत्री श्री स्टेल्ले बाल्डविन ने अपने एक नये मंत्री को सलाह दी थी कि हाउस आफ कामन्स कभी इस बात को बरदाश्त नहीं करेगा कि मंत्री उस को गुमराह करेया असत्य बोले। गोखले साहब को भी आप को यही सलाह देनी चाहिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आप से कह चुका हूँ कि मैं देख कर बतलाऊंगा।