

Mr. Speaker: There is no point of order. What I have not admitted can be discussed only inside, not here.

12.30 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. PRINTING OF
MADHYA PRADESH BUDGET

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): On 28th July certain questions were raised about the printing of the Madhya Pradesh budget. When I said I had no information, you directed me to get the information from Madhya Pradesh and give that information to the House. That very day I sent a wireless message. In reply to that I got a wireless message on the 29th which I have already conveyed to the Lok Sabha Secretariat. I would like to lay that wireless message on the Table of the House. If the hon. members want me to read the message....

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: It reads:

"Reference your wireless message No. 14459/67-JS(P) of 28th July, 1967 to Chief Secretary regarding adjournment motion about printing of budget literature of Madhya Pradesh. Facts are as follows:—

1. Interim budget 1967-68 of Madhya Pradesh was presented to Vidhan Sabha in March 1967 and vote on account for four months from April to July was obtained. On third July a revised budget of 1967-68 was presented to budget session of Vidhan Sabha which was prorogued on twentieth July while demands on education department were under discussion.

2. As no indication was available regarding the date on which the Vidhan Sabha would meet again and there was uncertainty regarding passage of budget be-

fore thirty-first July, the State administration had to take preliminary steps to meet various contingencies that might arise. These contingencies and the steps taken in regard thereto were.

- (i) after the Vidhan Sabha was resummoned the demands for grants might be voted and the appropriation bill for 1967-68 passed. So the appropriation Bill was prepared and sent to Vidhan Sabha after obtaining Governor's approval.
- (ii) If, after the Vidhan Sabha was resummoned, any of the demands for grants was not voted, the present Government might have to resign and another Government could take its place. In that event the new Government might not like to proceed with the passage of the full year's budget but might take another vote on account for one month till a modified budget was presented to and passed by Vidhan Sabha. For this contingency comma a document for obtaining vote on account from Vidhan Sabha for the month of August was printed and kept ready.
- (iii) The third possibility was issue of a proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution imposing President's rule in the State. If this contingency arose, it would become necessary to present the State budget in Parliament. As it would not be possible to get the full budget passed before thirty-first July, a vote on account for one month would have to be obtained. For this purpose, the budget presented to the Vidhan Sabha was reprinted with suitable modifications incidental to its presentation to Parliament. A document for obtaining vote

[Shri Y. B. Chavan.]

on account from Parliament for meeting the expenditure of the State during August was also printed. No budget for three months was prepared.

3. Action taken by the State Administration was motivated by the need for catering to all possible contingencies. Any delay in the passage of the budget or, if necessary, in obtaining another vote on account, would mean serious dislocation of Government work as, in that case, no moneys could be drawn from the consolidated fund of the State after thirty-first July. The action was not taken owing to any alleged decision regarding extension of President's rule to Madhya Pradesh. The State administration is not aware of any such decision.

4. The allegation that any budget document contains a note stating that the budget could not be passed due to violence in the State Legislature is false. The allegation that printed budget literature is being destroyed is also false.

5. Usually, State budgets which are to be presented to Parliament are printed in the printing presses of State Governments concerned.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): That is what I was telling you the other day.

Shri Y. B. Chavan:

"For instance, the budget estimates of Rajasthan 1967-68 which were presented to Parliament in March 1967 were printed in Government Central Press, Jaipur. Similarly, the budget estimates of 1966-67 of the State of Kerala which were laid before Parliament had been printed at the Government Press, Trivandrum."

This is the message I have received from them. The other question that

was raised is whether we had given them any advice. It is obvious that we had neither given any advice nor any instructions.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: After the statement you cannot have an immediate discussion.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर): आप जरा हमारा बात तो सुनिये ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने एक विशेषाधिकार के प्रस्ताव का नोटिस दिया था श्री टारिका प्रसाद मिश्र के खिलाफ, और गृह मंत्री ने जो कुछ कहा है

Mr. Speaker: The point is whether we should have a discussion.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: आप इसकी इजाजत दोजिये । हमें कुछ कहने का मौका दोजिये, निर्णय बाद में कीजियेगा ।

श्री मधु लिमये: आप हमारी बात सुन लीजिये, निर्णय बाद में कीजियेगा । यह सवाल विशेषाधिकार का है ।

Mr. Speaker: The privilege motion is there, whatever name it is given. Ultimately it turns out to be a discussion. The Home Minister has made a statement.

Shri A. B. Vajpayee: He has read out a statement.

श्री मधु लिमये: इसा लिय मैं विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ ।

Mr. Speaker: You have also given me notice. The Home Minister has not denied nor has the M.P. government denied it. Therefore, give me time. Your privilege motion is before me.

श्री मधु लिमये: विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न तत्काल लिया जाना चाहिये । एक क्षण भी देर नहीं होनी चाहिये ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Is the point of order against the Speaker? Please resume your seat. We shall fix up some time if you want to discuss it. If you want an immediate discussion, it is not possible.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : क्या आप हम को इस बात की उजाड़न नहीं देंगे कि हम आप के सामने मामला रखें, जिसमें आप की

Mr. Speaker: The Speaker must admit it.

Shri Ranga (Srikakulam): If you have not admitted it, what are we to discuss? I would like to know.

Mr. Speaker: My point is that hon. Members may wait a little; when I admit it, I shall say so and then we shall begin a discussion.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विज्ञापिका का प्रस्ताव आप के पास है, प्रोग में चाहेंगा कि आप उसे स्वीकार करें।

Mr. Speaker: Not in the House, not now.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : लेकिन आप हम को मौका तो दीजिये।

Mr. Speaker: Not, not in the House.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बहुत गम्भीर बात है...

श्री मधु लिव्ये : गृह मंत्री के खिलाफ प्रिमा फ़ेशो केस बन जाता है।

Mr. Speaker: If you want the Home Minister to say something, then we begin the discussion now. You have stated what you wanted to say. Will 1689 (a) LSD—6.

you allow me to consider it and admit it later on and have a discussion? It will be better. If you go according to the rules there is that procedure. You have given me a motion and the Home Minister has made a statement. I shall fix a time and we will be able to discuss it. We cannot begin asking question now.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। उस दिन गृह मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि लोक सभा के सामने रखे जाने वाले बजट और कहीं नहीं छग सकते। इसके लिये उन्होंने उप-प्रधान मंत्री की गवाही ली और यह कहा कि वह नहीं छपा गया। लेकिन आज गृह मंत्री महोदय को मानना पड़ा कि वहाँ छपा था। उसके वहाँ छापने के कारण क्या थे, इसमें मैं नहीं जाना चाहता। लेकिन गृह मंत्री यह तो बतलायें कि इस तरह से बजट छपा जाता है, क्या वह इससे सन्तुष्ट हैं, और क्या हम यह समझें कि गृह मंत्री महोदय को इसके बारे में जानकारी नहीं है।

Mr. Speaker: You should not go into details now.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उस दिन आप ने सुना कि गृह मंत्री महोदय ने कहा था कि बजट वहाँ नहीं छप सकता। आज गृह मंत्री कह रहे हैं कि बजट वहाँ छपा था। (*Interruption*)

An Hon. Member rose—

Mr. Speaker: Your leader has spoken. Don't you give him even that much credit? Shri Nath Pai.

Shri Kachwal rose—

Mr. Speaker: I have called Shri Nath Pai. The hon. Members will kindly sit down.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I rise to a point of order.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji (Howrah): Sir, I have a point of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I raised a point of order long ago.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. Yours was the first point of order. Shri Banerjee's point of order is earlier than Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji's. I will call them. Now Shri Nath Pai.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the first place, we would like to submit to you, whereas one can appreciate that you are agreeable to give the House an opportunity to ventilate its legitimate grievance, you have also stated in the House that the rules will also have to be followed, and once you have been good enough to admit a motion for breach of privilege, it takes precedence over anything else. We raised this matter, and we confined ourselves, on Friday last, at your instance, only to one aspect, though there were other aspects. We stated that the Assembly was being dissolved as the Prime Minister was in favour of dissolution. according to a statement in one of the daily newspapers in Delhi—(Interruption)—it is a very reliable paper, particularly when the Government is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Nath Pai: I must satisfy them also. Sometimes, it is good to satisfy them. Now, the *Patriot*, the daily paper from Delhi, said that the Prime Minister was in favour of dissolution.

Some hon. Members rose—(Interruption).

Shri Nath Pai: I said I am not raising a point of order. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Vajpayee and I submitted to you on that day that our apprehension was based on the available knowledge which is verifiable. We understood and we said that preparation for

throttling the voice of Assembly there has gone to such an extent that the budget was prepared. We said we would get a copy of the budget. We said that the information has come not from a Member (Interruption) but that the information was given by an individual who will be forming the Government if democracy was allowed to function. Now, the Home Minister should at least have the grace to apologise to the House;—for him, it is unthinkable that the budget to be presented to Parliament will be prepared and printed in the State there. Mr. Chavan is a good democrat and should know, of course, personally himself that everything was ready for the burial and only the funeral was to be taken. The preparation of the budget was nothing but a conspiracy to defy the wishes of the people. (Interruption). We have got this right. We wrote to you. I wrote to you a letter and you were good enough to say, "Not now, let us wait." I think you will recall that you asked us to obey, and even today I am obeying you. (Interruption). Now, I wish to submit that Mr. Chavan's statement, based on a wireless message he got, indicates that had not the voice of the people been raised here, in Parliament, the Chief Minister would have continued with his plan to throttle the voice of democracy. Mr. Chavan today admits that the budget was prepared. He said that day that the budget cannot be printed. He has now admitted that the budget to be presented was already printed; the so-called precaution and wisdom that was exercised is not a precaution at all,—what is paraded as a precaution. I am asking the Home Minister—

Mr. Speaker: He is going into the merits now.

Shri Nath Pai: What I say is, not just a question of admission. Do you mean to say, Sir, that all that is called for on this occasion, so grave an occasion, is just an admission but not an apology to the House? I want to know. (Interruption). I do not charge that he is deliberately lying.

That is not it. I only submit that Mr. Chavan's statement is not in harmony with the submission, the admission, and at least a candid apology is called for from Mr. Chavan.

Shri Y. B. Chavan: If the House wants an apology, I will not hesitate to give an apology. If I have been stand on prestige. If I have been mistaken or if I find I have been wrong, and if I have given any affront to the House or have committed any breach of privilege of the House, I will not only once or twice apologise, but I will apologise a hundred times. The point that I wish to make is that, when I was on my legs the other day, I did say that first of all I had no information I really had no knowledge of the procedure where such budgets were printed. So, I said in the House that I consulted the Finance Minister; the Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister was present in the House and I consulted him about it; and he said he thought that they are not printed in the States. But later on he confirmed that it is also printed in different States. I gave the information as I got it. I therefore, thought I owed this explanation to the House, the circumstances under which I made that statement, and I take this opportunity to correct it. If for that mistake any apology is necessary, I am prepared to apologise.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, if he has apologised, then I shall not raise my point of order (*Interruptions*).

Shri Surenranath Dwivedy: Sir, from the records it can be seen that when he made that statement I pointed out that when the budget for Orissa was submitted to the House it was printed in the State of Orissa. But still he said: "No, this is the information I have got".

Mr. Speaker: Are we beginning with the discussion now. I suggested taking it up later on if I admit it. I

have not yet admitted it. If before that we begin the discussion now, it would be absolutely useless. I do not know what points anybody wants to raise. We are now going into the merits and all that (*Interruption*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): Mr. Speaker, Sir, pending whatever discussion might or might not take place, we have all been concerned about certain proprieties that are to be observed by Government. It took a great deal of goading by many of us under very difficult circumstances to get the Home Minister to say that he was sorry. I would not have intervened except for the fact that on that occasion...

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I had no opportunity to say so.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: On the last occasion, I remember distinctly, when Shri Surendranath Dwivedy pointed out about Orissa and when Shri Vasudevan Nair pointed out about Kerala, the mistake was made. What I want is, when the Government comes forward with a statement of the sort that Shri Chavan was armed with this morning, he should explain the position in regard to what happened on that day. On that day, consulting the Deputy Prime Minister he had made a statement about the procedure of printing the budget documents. I am not blaming them for it. They made a mistake. But they do not admit a mistake. They do have to be told again and again by a succession of speakers on this side, who do not want to waste the time of the House for a single second. We have been driven to this because the Government is behaving in this manner. I wish you take your stand on propriety. I wish you, Sir, take a definite stand on the point of propriety. We shall never see order in this House if Government is allowed to behave in an improper fashion—it may be a small matter but improper all the same. I wish you to make your own observation on this point.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: A point of propriety cannot override the rules. The rule is very explicit on this point. There is rule 222 and also rule 224(iii). Under these rules before any privilege question is discussed in this House your consent is necessary. Rule 224(iii) is still more explicit and it lays down that the matter should require the intervention of the House. After the statement of the hon. Home Minister the intervention of the House is not at all essential. That is our view. Also, your consent has not been given to this issue being raised. Therefore, this discussion overrides the rules. How many times you should be lenient like this when hon. Members override the rules, is my question?

Mr. Speaker: I entirely agree with you it is a relevant point of order. But my difficulty is that we have made a convention that after the Minister's statement there will be no questions. We can only fix some time for discussion, if admitted.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अभी भोपाल से आया हूँ। मैं आप को नई जानकारी दे रहा हूँ। मैं मेरिट्स में नहीं जा रहा हूँ। जहाँ तक प्रिविलेज का सवाल है, नेहरे पर जो भाव है, सतह पर जो बात है, उनसे बिल्कुल प्रिमा फेशी केस बन जाता है। लेकिन इस वक्त मैं उनमें नहीं जा रहा हूँ। मंत्री जी ने जो वक्तव्य दिया है, वह उनके द्वारा मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार से हासिल की गई जानकारी के आधार पर है, क्योंकि उनके पास इस सम्बन्ध में एक तार या पत्र आया है। उन्होंने कहा है कि तीन प्रसंगों का सामना करने के लिए तैयारी की गई थी। वहाँ पर जो बजट मेमोरेण्डम छपा है, उस पर लिखा हुआ "एज लेड बिकोर दि पालियामेंट"। उसमें एक भोट है कि 28 जुलाई को विधान सभा में जो हिंसा हुई, जो हंगामा हुआ, उसके कारण यह बजट पालियामेंट में पेश किया जा रहा है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि

क्या श्री द्वारिका प्रसाद मिश्र ने इस स्थिति को भी एन्टीसिपेट किया था? मंत्री महोदय ने इस बारे में कोई जानकारी नहीं दी है।

श्री शशिभूषण बाजपेयी (खारगोन) : मध्य प्रदेश में पैसे और गोलीयों की घमकियों की बदौलत जो झगड़ा किया गया, अगर उसका जिक्र किया, तो क्या शलत था? (व्यवधान)

Mr. Speaker: Will you kindly sit down? A very healthy convention we have developed that after Minister's statement there will be no discussion. If we want to have a discussion, we can have it today evening or sometime later; that was the procedure we have evolved.

श्री मधु लिमये : आज ही होनी चाहिए।

Mr. Speaker: It may be so. If any privilege motion or calling attention notice is given notice of and it is rejected, it could be raised by the Member concerned inside the chamber, but not in the House. If the Speaker rejects any motion, for good reasons or bad reasons, mistakenly or because he has not full information, the Member can ask him to reconsider his decision, inside his chamber but not on the floor of the House.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या यह कोई मामूली मामला है?

Mr. Speaker: That was the convention which we have been following. It has worked very well till now. Every day I receive about 50 Calling Attention Notices and only one or two are admitted. While I am not very sure about those two members, whose notices have been admitted, I am certain that definitely 48 members are displeased by my rejecting their notices. If all those 48 members try, to raise it in the House, how can we function? When we are following a convention, why should we break it today? The motion is here. It was printed in Bhopal has been mentioned there. There is no

doubt about it and it has not been contested by the Minister either.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It was a conspiracy.

श्री शशिभूषण बाजपेयी : राजमाता की कान्सप्रेसरी (षड्यंत्र) थी ।

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Home Minister has said, yes, it has been printed and all that. There is not much controversy about the facts; the facts have been admitted. The question is whether we should have a discussion, on which I will give my decision. Here I am only talking about the procedure. If this healthy procedure of not asking questions immediately after the statement of the Minister is broken and if the leaders of parties get up and start speaking, then no further discussion is necessary later on. Therefore, will you kindly allow me to proceed to the next item. I shall see when it can be taken up and in what form it should be taken up. That should be left entirely to me.

Now, we will take up item 4 of the agenda. Shri Limaye.

Shri M. L. Sondhi (New Delhi): Sir, the question of dearness allowance to the Government servants....

Mr. Speaker: It could not be raised at this stage.

श्री अब्दुल गनी डार (गुड़गांव) : भ्रान ए पायंट ग्राफ़ आर्डर, सर । स्पीकर साहब, मैं आप से प्रोटैक्शन चाहता हूँ । मिनिस्टर साहब के पास जो वायरलेस पैगाम भ्राया है, उसके बारे में तो उन्होंने इस हाउस को कान्फ़िडेंस में लिया है, लेकिन क्या यह जरूरी नहीं था और क्या यह मिनिस्टर साहब का फ़र्ज नहीं था कि श्री मधु लिमये ने भ्रमी जो सवाल उठाया है, वह अपने बयान में उसका भी जिक्र करते । जैसा कि श्री मधु लिमये ने बताया है, उस बजट पर लिखा हुआ था कि बूक हाउस में तशद्द या वायरलेस हुआ, इसलिए इस बजट को पालियामेंट में पेश किया जा रहा है । मैं आप की प्रोटैक्शन

चाहता हूँ और आप से दरक़्बास्त करता हूँ कि आप होम मिनिस्टर साहब को यह हिदायत दें कि उनके पास जो इतिला हो या उनके पास जो भी वायरलेस पैगाम बग़ैरह भ्राये, वह उसके मुताल्लिक पूरी इनफ़र्मेशन इस हाउस को दे ।

[श्री عبدالغلی ڈار : آن اے پرائنٹ آف آرڈر - سر - اسپیکر صاحب - میں آپ سے پروٹیکشن چاہتا ہوں - منسٹر صاحب کے پاس جو وائرلیس پیغام آیا ہے - اس کے بارے میں تو انہوں نے اس ہاؤس کو کانفیڈنس میں لیا ہے - لیکن کیا یہ ضروری نہیں تھا اور کیا یہ منسٹر صاحب کا فرض نہیں تھا کہ شری مدھو لمئے نے ابھی جو سوال اٹھایا ہے - وہ اچھے بیان میں اس کا بھی ذکر کرتے - جیسا کہ شری مدھو لمئے نے بتایا ہے - اس بجٹ پر لکھا ہوا تھا کہ چونکہ ہاؤس میں تمدد یا وائرلیس ہوا - اس لئے اس بجٹ کو پارلیمنٹ میں پھینک دیا جا رہا ہے - میں آپ کی پروٹیکشن چاہتا ہوں اور آپ سے درخواست کرتا ہوں کہ آپ ہوم منسٹر صاحب کو یہ ہدایت دیں کہ ان کے پاس جو اطلاع ہو یا ان کے پاس جو بھی وائرلیس پیغام وغیرہ آئے - وہ اس کے متعلق پوری انفارمیشن اس ہاؤس کو دیں -]

Mr. Speaker: Now what is the protection? Who is in danger? So, he may kindly sit down. We will

[Mr. Speaker]

take up the next item, the motion about the Second Report of the Committee of Privileges by Shri Madhu Limaye.

Shri Sheo Narain rose—

Mr. Speaker: Shri Kachwai is sitting now. There is absolutely no reason for you to get up.

Shri Bal Raj Madhok (South Delhi): We may have a bout between Shri Kachwai and Shri Sheo Narain one day.

Mr. Speaker: I am not allowing it.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: About this dearness allowance question, there are agitations all over the country.

Mr. Speaker: It should not be raised like this.

Shri M. L. Sondhi: When you changed the subject....

Mr. Speaker: It is an important point but nobody can just get up like this and raise a point. There must be some rule for it. You can represent that in my Chamber or write to me or do something.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly only ask the Finance Minister to make a statement.

Mr. Speaker: No, please. I will not ask him now. You write to me.

श्री शिव नारायण : (बस्ती) : भ्रान ए पायंट ब्राफ़ आर्डर, सर । मेरा पायंट ब्राफ़ आर्डर यह है कि आपोजीशन के सदस्य जो प्लाईग रिमाक्स कसते हैं, उनको ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिए । गवर्नमेंट से भी मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह ब्राफ़-हैंड जबाब न दिया करें ।

श्री ज्ञानिभूषण वाखपेयी : पायंट ब्राफ़ आर्डर, सर । आप से सिर्फ़ एक प्रार्थना है कि आप जो कालिग एटेंशन नोटिस लेते हैं, आप उन में से कभी कभी बहुत इम्पोर्टेंट नोटिसेज को इग्नोर कर जाते हैं । उत्तर प्रदेश में जर्दू की जो हत्या हो रही है, उसके बारे में कई सदस्यों ने कालिग एटेंशन नोटिस दिये हैं, लेकिन आप ने उन को नहीं लिया है ।

Mr. Speaker: Will you kindly sit down? There is no point of order.

12.58 hrs.

MOTION RE SECOND REPORT OF
PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE

श्री मधु लिनये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ :—

“कि विशेषाधिकार समिति के दूसरे प्रतिवेदन पर, जो 19 जुलाई, 1967 को सभा में पेश किया गया था, विचार किया जाये।”

इस सदन ने हिन्दी दैनिक “हिन्दुस्तान” के सम्पादक के खिलाफ़ उठाये गये विशेषाधिकार के प्रश्न को विशेषाधिकार समिति को सौंपा था । विशेषाधिकार समिति ने उस मामले की जांच कर के यह रपट हमारे सामने रखी है । वैसे, सतह पर जो बातें हैं, अगर हम उनको मद्दे-नजर रखेंगे, तो हमें विशेषाधिकार समिति की रपट में कोई दोष या कमी नहीं मिलेगी । हजारी रपट पर राज्य सभा और लोक सभा में जो चर्चा हुई और उसके सम्बन्ध में जो प्रश्न पूछे गये, उन को लेकर “हिन्दुस्तान” दैनिक के सम्पादकीय लेख में संसद् और संसद्-सदस्यों के बारे में बहुत भद्दी बातें लिखी गई थीं । विशेषाधिकार समिति ने उस लेख को देखने के बाद कहा है कि इस सदन के विशेषाधिकारों का भंग हुआ है और सम्पादक दोषी है । जब इस बारे में पत्र के सम्पादक को लिखा गया तो उन्होंने समिति को लिखी गई एक चिट्ठी में कहा कि वह इसके लिए