

not be restrained from saying things of this kind, he goes on to say—that obviously, that is an exceedingly undesirable and impossible task. Perhaps this remedy, he feels, will raise other complications. There is certainly a danger that this will place a limitation on free expression in this House and so on. In other words, I submit that this is a fair comment; it is well within the ambit of not only the right, but also the duty, of sound journalism to make such a remarks.

Mr. Speaker: So many hon. Members are standing. Do they want to have a debate on this?

श्री मधु लिमये: एक मिनट में भी उनका जवाब देना चाहूंगा। अभी अभी अखबारों की स्वतंत्रता की बात कही गई है। बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपतियों ने सारे अखबारों को खरीद लिया है, कहाँ है अब समाचार स्वतंत्रता।

Mr. Speaker: No, no. Now I put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

“That this question of breach of privilege against the columnist, Editor, Publisher, Printer and Proprietor of the *Hindustan Times* be referred to the Committee of Privileges.”

The motion was adopted.

12.49 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES ACT, 1947

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Shri L. N. Mishra): On behalf of Shri Hathi, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. S.O. 1776 published in Gazette of India, dated the 20th May, 1967, under sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1957, adding ‘Service in any oil-field’ to First Sche-

dule to the said Act. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-542/67].

ANNUAL REPORT OF INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE

The Minister of Education (Dr. Triguna Sen): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, for the year 1964-65. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-543/67].

12.50 hrs.

RE: CALLING ATTENTION NOTICE

Mr. Speaker: Before I go to the other items of papers to be laid on the Table, I would like to say this. Mr. Nath Pai referred to some call attention or something and since I had not seen it, I was surprised where it had gone. Now I find that this came after 10.30. Normally according to rules, all the motions which are given till 10.30 are placed before me, and before I come to the House, I see them. But unfortunately Mr. Nath Pai's motion was given after 10.30. I was really wondering where it had gone. This is the reason why it was not seen by me. A decision on that has to be taken separately, independently. It was given later, after 10.30. That is what I understand from the office.

Shri Nath Pal (Rajapur): It has not been my habit to blame the Secretariat; they serve on the whole very loyally and at times very efficiently. I would not insist that they have made a representation to you which is not in harmony with the reality. So far as I can recall, when I was in the Notice Office—I had checked up the time—it was just 10.30. But the new rule which we have amended has not yet been accepted. Anyway, I would not be technical. May I make a request to you, if you are, on this technical ground, disallowing....

Mr. Speaker: No question of disallowing. It is a physical fact. I have not seen it.