

back in the same coin and then you should not resent. (Interruption).

Shri Morarji Desai: Withdraw what? I am not going to withdraw anything.

12 hrs.

I will say it with greater emphasis and stick to it.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Can a minister be irrelevant in his answer? (Interruptions).

Shri Morarji Desai: I am not going to submit to this kind of thing. (Interruptions). The hon. members should not get annoyed if I meet them squarely. I do not mind them meeting me squarely. I do not understand why they get annoyed. This is not the method of parliamentary tactics. I do not mind their interrupting me. But they ought to hear with patience what I tell them. Afterwards, they can say what they like. In this matter, the assurances are only in accordance with the policies we have framed for ourselves. They relate to two things that we are going to prosecute our agricultural programmes even more efficiently than before and that in the matter of family planning also, the programmes will be taken ahead. There also, the assurances are only those which have been given so far by us. Nothing more is contemplated.

12.02 hrs.

RE. SITUATION IN PUNJAB AND RAJASTHAN

Mr. Speaker: The Home Minister.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : मैं दो तीन बार खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मेरा आप निवेदन सुन लें। आज आखिरी दिन है इसलिये आपके साथ कम्बर में बैठ कर कुछ चीजों के बारे में बात करना सम्भव नहीं है। दो मिनट ध्यानाकर्षण के प्रस्ताव दिये थे। एक राजस्थान में लोक-तंत्रीय सरकार के निर्माण के बारे में जिस पर सभी बिरोधी दल

183 (A1) LS—2.

Mr. Speaker: If I allow him, I will have to allow everybody.

Shri Randhir Singh (Rohtak): There is no Government in Punjab.

Shri Ram Kishan Gupta (Hissar): Constitution has failed there.

श्री मधु लिमये : 22 मई तक हम मिलें नहीं। आप सुनेंगे भी नहीं, फिर कहेंगे कि मैं चित्लाता हूँ

Mr. Speaker: Rajasthan is important, I agree. I also agree that Punjab is equally important. But we are in the midst of some business. The Home Minister will make a statement.

श्री मधु लिमये : 22 मई के पहले हम लोग यहाँ आने वाले नहीं हैं, इसलिये क्या यह मंत्री राजस्थान की स्थिति पर कोई वयान करेंगे ?

Mr. Speaker: He says, Punjab first.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप उनकी बात भी सुन लें : मैं कहाँ मना कर रहा हूँ। उनके बात भी सुन लें, आज आखिरी दिन है।

श्री श्रींकार लाल बेरवा: (कोटा) : पहले राजस्थान को लिया जाये।

Mr. Speaker: I request all members to sit down. I entirely agree that Rajasthan is important and Punjab is equally important. If one raises one point, the other side also wants to raise something. You cannot give an oppounity to one group alone. One group alone cannot be treated as a privileged group.

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रिवलेज का क्या मतलब है। आप हमें नेता नेता कहते हैं, एक मिनट बात भी नहीं सुनेंगे।

Mr. Speaker: If I hear everybody for one minute each, one hour will be spent on this.

श्री मधु लिमये : तो फिर मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

Mr. Speaker: There is no subject before us.

श्री मधु लिमये : कार्य सूची के बारे में है।

Mr. Speaker: How does it come now.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिये। एक मिनट नहीं सुनें ?

Mr. Speaker: This always happens. Naturally, when one begins to raise something, others also will begin to do the something. There must be some method of raising these things. You have made the rules. You change them and say that any hon. Member can raise anything at any time. I have no objection. What does it matter to me whether the Home Minister makes a statement or the Finance Minister makes the statement.

श्री मधु लिमये : उनकी बात भी सुनने के लिये मैं आप से कह रहा हूँ। उनकी धोर से भी बोल रहा हूँ। पंजाब पर भी बहस हो।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Berwa must sit down. I am on my legs. When I am on my legs nobody should start shouting. I am not prepared to hear anybody now. As I said, you may change the rules, I have no objection and I will abide by them. But there is absolutely nothing before the House.

श्री मधु लिमये : आपकी मदद कर रहे हैं कार्रवाई में। मेरा निवेदन है कि गृह मंत्री राजस्थान की स्थिति पर ध्यान करें।

श्री राम किशन गुप्ता (हिंसार) : पहले पंजाब पर।

Mr. Speaker: In the name of point or order if you want to raise some subject here, everybody can do that. It is not the privilege of one hon. Member alone, everybody can do that. If we encourage that, then there will be no end to it and no work can be carried on here. In the

name of point of order you want to bring in the subject of Rajasthan. Then others can bring in Madras, Bengal and every other State. In that case anybody can raise any subject at any time and talk on that.

श्री मधु लिमये : सब को एक एक मिनट सुन लीजिये।

Mr. Speaker: No, no. I cannot allow that. How can I allow any hon. Member to raise a subject, in the name of point of order, which is not on the Agenda? Rajasthan has no reference to the Agenda for today. If I allow Shri Limaye to raise it, how can I object to others raising their points?

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कहां मना कर रहा हूँ। पहले उनकी बात को ही आप सुन लें।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am trying to lay down a procedure. If in the name of point of order... (Interruptions). Order, order. If I permit one to raise a point of order on any subject, then I will have to allow others also. I am not prepared to allow anybody to raise anything at any time. Why should one hon. Member alone have the privilege of raising something in the name of point of order? If I allow one hon. Member to do that, what right have I to prevent others from doing the something.

श्री मधु लिमये : पन्द्रह साल से यह चला आ रहा है। हमेशा सुना जाता है। नई कौन सी बात बली है। आज आखिरी दिन है।

Mr. Speaker: If somebody does something wrong, I cannot allow the whole House to do it.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कह रहा हूँ कि उनकी बात भी आप सुन लें। मैं कहां मना करता हूँ ?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If I allow him I will not be able to stop others from doing it.

Shri Bhogendra Jha (Jainagar): Sir, my point of order is very relevant. I will not rise anything which is not to the point.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not prepared to hear anything now. Let us hear the hon. Minister of Home Affairs on the Privilege Motion.

12.08 hrs.

**QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE RE:
ARREST OF MEMBER**

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): Sir, yesterday, when this question of privilege was under consideration, you gave me some time to collect all the information. I asked the Chief Secretary, Delhi Administration, yesterday, to make an enquiry. He met Shri Brahmanand at the crossing near the north gate of Parliament House and recorded his statement. He also recorded the statements of the District Magistrate, the Additional District Magistrate, the Watch and Ward Officer of the Parliament House, the SDM, Parliament Street and police officers concerned in the affair. The Chief Secretary's conclusions are: (1) that Shri Brahmanand and his followers had been trying to court arrest; the magistrate and the police, however, did not consider their arrest necessary....

Shri Hem Barua (Mangalore): What do you mean by trying to court arrest?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I will explain everything. Please have patience. .. By getting into the police trucks at about 3 p.m. on 5th April, Shri Brahmanand and his followers were under the erroneous impression that they had succeeded in getting themselves arrested. There was, in fact, no arrest and they were not forced to get into trucks. Shri Brahmanand and his followers were treated with courtesy at Parliament Street Police Station. They remained in the Police Station for about two hours with a view to getting themselves arrested. When they did not succeed, they dispersed. These are the conclusions of the Chief Secretary.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Speaker: Let him finish his statement.

श्री हुकूम खान कलकत्ता (उज्जैन) : क्या मंत्री महोदय ने अधिकारियों की इन बातों पर विश्वास कर लिया है ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: You will have to see the whole background. I am as keen and as jealous of the rights of the Members of Parliament as every member should be. But here is a very different background of the question. The procedure of informing Parliament about the arrest of a member is there because a Member will have to attend the session of Parliament. But here is a Member of Parliament who wanted to be arrested and, therefore, the facts get confused. So, really speaking, the question is whether in fact the member in question was arrested or not. The conclusion of the Chief Secretary which I read is that he was not in fact arrested.... (Interruptions). Please listen to me, because I am making a statement. I am in your hands. I am in the hands of the House. If really speaking, the House wants and you want that the whole question should be gone into by the Privileges Committee, I would welcome it, because it is much better that these inquiries fix the responsibility. Because, the responsibilities of the Members of Parliament are also then made clear. Otherwise, the law and order agencies get confused. How are they to function? Here was a Member of Parliament who wanted to get himself arrested and, looking to their own responsibilities, they refused to arrest him. This has been made the issue of privilege. Therefore, I do not want to take a position as if I want to come in the way of the Privileges Committee going into the facts of the case. I am completely in your hands. If you feel that it should be referred to the Privileges Committee, I have no objection.

श्री बदल बिहारी पाकनेबी : (बलरामपुर)
अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने कल प्राणनीय सदस्य,