

- (ii) Improvement in pay scales of lowest paid categories of primary Teachers and other allied categories ;
- (iii) Increase in the rate of increment and reduction in the time span to 12 years in the pay scales of all categories of teachers ;
- (iv) Grant of Selection Grade to all teachers on completion of six years of service ; and
- (v) Fixation of pay on point to point basis, i.e., one increment for every three years service, with a ceiling of three increments.

These demands have been carefully considered by the Government, but it has not been possible to deviate from the recommendations of the third pay commission.

Development of Drought-Prone Areas

2000. SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION be pleased to state :

- (a) whether a large scale project for developing drought-prone areas in some States has been drawn up.
- (b) if so, the main features of the programme ; and
- (c) whether Orissa has been covered under this programme ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION (SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN) : (a) Yes, Sir.

- (b) A statement is enclosed.
- (c) Yes, Sir.

Statement

Main features of the Drought Prone Areas Programme

Drought Prone Areas Programme aims at the integrated rural development in

agriculture and allied sectors in the selected drought-prone areas. The emphasis is on securing investments which should not only provide a continuing development but also generate future employment. Effort is being made to ensure that district as a unit is conceived for the purpose of project formulation. Various elements required for the development of a district are projected on the basis of resource endowment to link up in such a manner that every element is directly related to the others. The prime concern is to ensure a comparative stability in farm incomes through investments at micro and macro levels. The Programme concentrates on the weaker sections of rural societies to maximise the income stability of these sectors. The core of the programme is towards optimal utilization of land and water as a resource. The programme elements cover such activities as soil and moisture conservation, afforestations, development and management of irrigation resources, development of agriculture, cattle development linked with dairy, sheep development linked with pistan, development of piggery, poultry etc.

12.01 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—Contd. IMPORT LICENCE CASE—contd.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : Sir, I have given notice of a privilege motion against Shri Lalit Narayan Mishra because he has deliberately made a wrong statement to mislead the House. (*Interruptions*).....

श्री जयु लिवये (बाका) : महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का सवाल है। इस सदन की कार्यवाही कैसे चले इस के बारे में मैं व्यवस्था का सवाल उठा रहा हूँ। . . . (व्यवधान) . . .

श्री डॉक्टर बचन सिंह (बतार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक क्षण में इतने कैसे लड़

हो गए ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप जिन का नाम पुकारे वही खड़े हों । मैं नहीं चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन में इस तरह की बात चले । मैं इस के खिलाफ प्रोटैस्ट करता हूँ । ये इनने लोग कैसे खड़े हैं ? बार बार इस सदन में इस तरह की बात होती है । आप जिन का नाम पुकारें, जिन को बोलने का मौका दें वे बोलें । क्या है यह ? मछली बाजार है ? यह सदन है, सदन ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम तो चुपचाप खड़े थे, ये क्यों बोल रहे थे ? क्या आप की इजाजत से चिन्ता रहे थे ?

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह : आप लोगों को चुप कराने के लिए मैं चिन्ता रहा था ।

श्री जय लिये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप का यह कहना दुस्त है कि एक रात्र सभी लोग बोलेंगे तो किसी को भी मुन नहीं पाएंगे । इसलिए मैं पहले इस पर व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ कि अब क्वेश्चन अवर समाप्त हुआ । उस के बाद आप के निर्देशों के अनुसार भव ने पहले प्रिविलेज मोशन लिया जाना चाहिए । बाकी आडर पेपर पर जो विजनेस है उस से ज्यादा बरीयता, उस से ज्यादा प्राथमिकता आप को प्रिविलेज मोशन को देनी चाहिए ।

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त (अलीपुर) : यह पॉइंट है ।

श्री जय लिये : यही तो कह रहा हूँ । इसीलिए इस को सब से पहले लेना चाहिए । मामला कहां तक आया है सभी लोग जानते हैं और आप भी जानते हैं कि मुकद्दर को यह सबाल उठा कि आप को जो पत्र लिखा गया था क्या यह इस सदन का और सेशन का अन्वय है ? तो बहुत सारी बातें होने के बाद श्री ब्रह्मानंद रेड्डी ने यह सकाराई दी कि मैं समझ नहीं पाया

था कि क्या निर्णय हुआ था इसलिए मैं कन्फ्यूज्ड था, तो कम्पेनैट आउन्ड पर कंटेन्ट के प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लिया गया । मैंने श्याम बाबू से बिजनी की कि आप अपने प्रस्ताव को प्रेस न कीजिए और उन्होंने दया बुद्धि से, कम्पेनैट के आउन्ड पर अपने प्रस्ताव को पेश नहीं किया । यहा तक कार्यवाही आई थी ।

अब अध्यक्ष महोदय, सी बी आई की रिपोर्ट के बारे में भी जैसी हम लोगों ने मांग की है ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI VASANT SATHE (AKOLA) : It was rejected by the Deputy-Speaker. All this is a "compassionate grounds" and all that.....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You can say, "not correct". Don't use that word.

It is unparliamentary. Delete it.

श्री जय लिये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, तीन कार्यवाही उसके लिए करनी पड़ेगी । (1) सी० बी० आई० की रेजीलेंट रिपोर्ट नहीं सब रिपोर्ट और दूसरी भी रिपोर्ट्स इस इन्वेस्टिगेशन के बारे में ले करने के बारे में क्या आप अपना स्पष्ट निर्णय, जो कुछ भी हुआ है उसकी रोशनी में देगे ? (2) हम मिनिस्टर्स से व्यक्तिगत सुनना चाहते हैं क्योंकि प्रिविलेज का मामला सरकार के खिलाफ नहीं एक एक मिनिस्टर और सदन के खिलाफ है । (3) इनके द्वारा घुमा फिरा कर जो सब-जुडिस वाला मामला रखा गया है उसके बारे में आप हम को क्रमशः मुनिए । सी० बी० आई० की रिपोर्ट के बारे में कॉलिंग, मिनिस्टर्स के बयान और उसके बाद आप हम को जवाबी भावग करने के लिए बुलाइए, फिर प्रिविलेज के सबाल पर अपनी क्लिब आप कीजिए ।

**Expunged as ordered by the Chak.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU
 Sir, I have given notice of a breach of privilege motion. I would like to make a submission on what I have already written to you.

MR. SPEAKER. No other privilege motion can come now when we are already having before us a privilege motion under discussion.

अभी पहला चल रहा है, दूसरा कैसे लेंगे ?

अभी एक सवाल चल रहा है। उसके बीच में एक और कैसे ले जाएं ? उन्हीं में सभी को शामिल कर लीजिए आप।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : जो चार्ज शीट सी बी आई ने दी है उस चार्जशीट के प्राधार पर नया प्रिविलेज मोशन बनता है श्री एल एन मिश्र के खिलाफ। उसका नोटिस भ्रामा है, उसको आप शामिल कर लीजिए।

MR. SPEAKER : They will all be treated as one.

उसी में कर सकते हैं। डिस्कशन जो चल रहा है, उसी में कर लीजिए।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Sir, you were kind enough in your wisdom, if I understood aright, after the point of order was finished, to allow me to make a submission under Rule 223. It is a breach of privilege motion under appropriate rules against Shri L. N. Mishra....
(Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसमें मैंने कह दिया है कि जो आपका है वह उसी में चलता रहेगा।

सब शामिल चलेगा। सब इकट्ठे ही चलेगें।

पहले मैं एक बात क्लीयर कर लू कि आपने यह ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन दिया है...

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : वह तो पीछे भावेंगे। पहले तो प्रिविलेज का मामला

है। पहले धनर प्रिविलेज मोशन को ले लेंगे तो ऐडजर्नमेंट पीछे चला जायगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसमें पहले ऐडजर्नमेंट मोशन है, उसके बाद प्रिविलेज रखा हुआ है।

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAJEE :
 We are not pressing our adjournment motions.

At least, I am not pressing for it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :
 I am not pressing for it today.

The facts of the case are as follows :

Shri L. N. Mishra, in his personal explanation dated 20th August, 1974 said :

" I recollect having received letter purporting to bear the signatures of a number of MPs when I was in-charge of the former Ministry of Foreign Trade. As far as I remember...
(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (MUVAT-TUPUZHA) : I rise on a point of order. For the last three days, certain things have been pending here. They all started with a privilege motion. Three or four friends of the Opposition gave notice of a motion which you, in your discretion, could have either admitted or refused. Any way you preferred that they might be heard in the open House. That privilege motion is pending. A final ruling has not been given on that. Rule 224 reads as follows :—

" The right to raise a question of privilege shall be governed by the following conditions, namely,

(i) not more than one question shall be raised at the same sitting..."

I would like to know whether the privilege motion, given notice of, is pending decision or not. If it is pending decision, then without disposing that of another

privilege motion cannot be raised in this House. A new motion has now been raised. My submission, therefore, is that this privilege motion which is now given notice of cannot be taken note of, let this alone be heard. A privilege motion is already pending, and it is your responsibility, as Speaker of the House, to tell us whether you consider that privilege motion to be in conformity with the rules of procedure, so that we may decide whether it should be admitted under rule 222. To allow that to be pending and during its pendency another privilege motion coming and then a public hearing being given to that, another subsidiary motion coming out of that, carrying on the matter unendingly like this will obstruct the proceedings of the entire House. We, the members of this House, have got the right to request that the business on the agenda be taken up and disposed of. A privilege question has, of course, a certain priority. The matter which could be considered in the Chamber, you preferred to hear in the House. (Interruptions) My point of order is simply this. When a privilege motion is pending consideration by you and when the House is seized of that matter, no other privilege motion should be listened to and should be taken notice of. Therefore, the attempt of Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu to raise another privilege motion is out of order. You may kindly rule that out of order and give us your ruling with respect to the privilege motion which has already been heard.

श्री छदल बिहारी बाबूदेवी : एक समय पर एक ही विषय उठ सकता है—यह नियम इस मामले में लागू नहीं होता है क्योंकि सारे प्रिविलेज एक ही विषय से जुड़े हुए हैं.

(अवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप अपना रुलिंग देने से पहले इस पर विचार कीजिये कि आप को

चार मेम्बरों ने तीन मंत्रियों के खिलाफ एक ही दिन प्रिविलेज के मोशनज दिये और आपने उनके बारे में विचार करना स्वीकार किया। आपने यह टेकनीकल आधार नहीं लिया कि एक दिन में एक ही मोशन आ सकता है, क्योंकि आप समझते हैं कि वे सब एक ही विषय से सम्बन्धित हैं। इसलिये कांग्रेस मेम्बर भी इस समय समझदारी का परिचय दें—क्योंकि सारे प्रिविलेज एक ही विषय से जुड़े हुए हैं. (अवधान)

आपने नोटिस देने वाले सब मेम्बरों को मुना, फिर आपने गृह मंत्री को बोलने के लिये कहा

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बतलाइये—क्या रोज सुना कर।

श्री छदल बिहारी बाबूदेवी : आप फसला कीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या फंसला कचेंये आ जाते हैं।

श्री छदल बिहारी बाबूदेवी : सी० बी० आई० की जो चार्जशीट अदालत में दाखिल हुई है, यदि उस के आधार पर नया प्रिविलेज मोशन बनता है तो क्या हम वे नहीं सकते ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप खुद कह रहे हैं कि नया बनाता है। जब पहले ही एक चल रहा है और उस के चलते हुए फिर आप एक नया दे रहे हैं तो नया तब ही आयगा जब पिछला खत्म हो जायगा।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : You called me, after considering this thing

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : You should allow this submission

MR. SPEAKER : You said, you are coming to a point of order

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Their skeleton is stinking in the cupboard

SHRI C.M. STEPHEN : You are the most stinking person in the world.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : He wants to destroy the Indian Parliament. Kindly regulate the proceedings of the House according to the rules. It will make things easy for all of us. Are you now going to listen to the point of order raised by Mr. Stephen. Please give your ruling. You have to decide.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नया कैसे आ जायेगा ? पिछला डिस्पोज नहीं हुआ तो दूसरा कैसे आ जायेगा ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : नया जरूर है लेकिन क्वेश्चन एक ही है। मोशन अलग-अलग है, लेकिन क्वेश्चन एक ही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप कहते हैं कि जो पुराना मोशन चल रहा है, उस के साथ जो दूसरे मोशन्स थे, वे सब आइडेंटिकल हैं। मैंने कहा कि अगर सब आइडेंटिकल है तो एक को ले लें। उस में सब कुछ आ जायेगा। उस को एक बना कर धीरे धीरे उसी को बस बना कर आप ने अपने ख्यालात का इस्तेमाल किया। अब उस तारीख के बाद फिर एक धीरे धीरे बात आती है तो वह एक सेप्रेट मोशन है।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : This is a separate privilege motion on the basis of the chargesheet that was given on Friday evening.

MR. SPEAKER : This is a separate motion. How can it come when we have already one before it ?

SHRI VASANT SATHE : No more submissions on that. He has given the ruling.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : (Bengal) : Have you shut us out on the subject ?

SHRI VASANT SATHI : Yes. You cannot reopen it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : This is an unusual step on the part of you. I want to be heard on this.

MR. SPEAKER : Now you come with a privilege motion arising out of a matter which arose on a different day. You are bringing it in a new shape. इसको कैसे ले सकते हैं।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : Please see rule 376. He has no right to be heard. This point is already over.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : He shouts; others are not allowed to speak.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : We are watching this for the past 3 days.

श्री मन्मथ लाल : आप हमारी बात सुन लें, उस के बाद आप जो निणय देंगे, वह हम मन्जूर हैं।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : There is no right to be heard under the rules. I am rising on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : I have replied to that.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : He cannot speak when you have given your ruling on that. Under Rule 376 I raise this point of order. I am not going to yield to his body.

MR. SPEAKER : As already stated by me, you have given a new motion. That cannot come unless this first item is disposed of. We are already dealing with the first item.

श्री बलराम साठे : किस बात पर आप सुनना चाहते हैं? आप नियम 376 देखिये

It says :

"Subject to conditions referred to in sub-rules (1) and (2), a member may formulate a point of order and the Speaker shall decide

whether the point raised is a point of order and if so give his decision thereon; which shall be final."

Your ruling is final. How can you hear them again ?

MR. SPEAKER : The point is : Is this a new privilege motion ? If it is a new privilege motion, it cannot arise when there is a privilege motion already pending. They are on a point of order. How can I say I do not allow.

श्री नक्ष लिम्बे : यह प्रेरणा कहा से मिली आज इन को ?

SHRI VASANT SATHE : They are holding the House to ransom for the last four days.

(Interruptions)

श्री छटल बिहारी जाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष जी, प्राय ने श्याम बाबू को बुलाया। अब यह टोका टाकी क्यों हो रही है ?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : The point that we are considering is whether any other complaint—I am laying stress on the word 'complaint'—against question—of breach of privilege could be made in the House on any day when some other motion of breach of privilege are pending

Sir, I am only looking towards the Chair. I am not doing anything at all.

My submission is that so far as complaints of breach of privilege are concerned, they have to be made immediately after the breach had occurred. It is now another question whether the question about the breach could be taken up by the House or not. But, this is obligatory on all of us
... (Interruptions).

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tunkur) : Sir, now I rise on a point of order. Now he says that it is a complaint. How are you allowing this ? (Interruptions).

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : In the House of Commons the practice is that the notice may not even be given to the Speaker because it is immediately attracting the breach and therefore a Member can come straight to the House and complain about the breach that has occurred. (Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : Sir, a point of order is that he cannot reopen this against your ruling given already on the point of order raised by me. My question is : can he raise this ?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, he should be called to order since you have asked Mr. Mishra to speak.

MR. SPEAKER . Kindly sit down. Let me listen to the point of order. Mr. Mishra has already raised a point of order.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : So, Sir, it is my respectful submission that when an offence had occurred, the First Information Report has to be lodged. And it is on lodging of the F.I.R. with regard to which a breach of privilege has been raised by Shri Basu, Shri Vajpayee and Shri Limaye. Here is an offence. It is not a question of charge-sheet. We have not come to that stage. We have only come before the House with a complaint that a breach of privilege has occurred about the lodging of the F.I.R. This is a breach of privilege. It is clear from the practice in the House of Commons that it has to be immediately lodged. It is for you to consider whether it should be taken on the next day or the third day. But, the Member would be failing in his duty if, after the breach of privilege has occurred,—the offence has been committed—he does not come to the House immediately about it... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Basu.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : The first thing is this. I have given a notice and I have stood up as soon as the question Hour

[Sri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

was over. And you were kind enough to direct me that after Mr. Limaye's point of order was over. I may make my submission. As soon as Mr. Madhu Limaye had finished his point of order and submission thereon, I was on my legs and I was making my submissions to your goodself. All that I wanted to say was to highlight and draw the attention of the House to your goodself. From the charge-sheet that has been placed on the Table of the House on Friday, late evening and, on the basis of the charge-sheet, I have formulated a privilege motion. If I had not done so, would you not agree that I have failed in my duty as a Member of this House? All that I wanted to do was to raise the issue and you allowed me to make my submission as brief as possible. In that process, my hon. friends got agitated and they prevented me from speaking.

MR. SPEAKER : It is a new privilege. Will you kindly sit down?

इस में बकन बचगा। अगर आप नहीं चाहते तो चलते दोजियां।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप पहले रूल के बारे में हमारी बात सुन लीजिये, हम आप की मदद करना चाहते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मदद तो क्या पता नहीं यह चीज कहा जाएगी।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष जी, हमने प्रिविलेज का नोटिस दिया है। यह भी ठीक है कि हमारी प्रिविलेज मोशन जो अदालत में चार्ज शीट दाखिल की गई है उसके आधार पर है। आप यह मानेंगे, व चार्ज शीट बाद में रखे गये हैं। जब पहले प्रिविलेज मोशन आए तब चार्ज शीट हमारे सामने नहीं था। हम उसे आधार बना कर कोई प्रिविलेज मोशन का नोटिस नहीं दे सकते हैं। अभी हमने नोटिस दिया है—आप रूल देखिये :

"Not more than one question shall be raised at the same sitting."

हम पुराने मोशन नहीं उठा रहे हैं। वे तो उठ चुके हैं। आज हम एक मोशन उठा रहे हैं। आप बारीकी से देखिये। चिल्लाने से तब मामला नहीं होगा। शान्ति से सुनना होगा। कोई दंगल नहीं है।

"Not more than one question shall be raise at the same sitting."

जो पुराने मोशन है वे पहले दिन रोज़ किंग जा चुके हैं। अब उन पर बहस हो रही है, मंत्रियों को स्पष्टीकरण देना है, आपको फंसना करना है। आज हम उन्हे उठा नहीं रहे हैं। कोई भी नियम हमें नए मोशन या नए मुद्दा उठाने से नहीं रोकता है। आप फंसना कर सकते हैं। जब तक पुगाने मोशन पर निर्णय नहीं होगा ये मोशन पैडिंग रहेंगे। यह फंसना दे दीजिए ये बेकार में शोर मचा रह है।

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा नया प्वाइंट है। मैं रिपोंट नहीं करना चाहता हू। पहली बात तो यह है कि नोटिस और क्वेश्चन में आपका फर्क करना चाहिये। एक ही नोटिस रख करने की बरत होती तो आपने क्वेश्चन या प्रिविलेज नोटिस का एक साथ क्या लिया? मेरे चार मोशन थे या नोटिस थे या कहिये एक ही क्वेश्चन के बारे में कि मिनिस्टर्स के द्वारा लाइसेंस कांड में सदन का अपमान किया गया। यह क्वेश्चन है उमाशंकर जी के खिलाफ, बट्टोपाध्याय जी के खिलाफ, गोखल जी के खिलाफ, एन एन मिश्र जी के खिलाफ, तुलसीमोहन राम जी के खिलाफ। पिछले संशन में ये मोशन दिए गए थे। उस पर आपने शन तक कोई निर्णय नहीं दिया। प्रिविलेज मोशन पेडिंग पड़े रहे। मैंने नोटिस को रिन्यू किया था पहले नोटिस दिया। नई कौन सी बात हुई? या चार नोटिस दिए जिस के ऊपर बारह तारीख को चर्चा शुरू हुई उसी का एक कागज नोटिस है। एक क्वेश्चन उसका वागनेट नोटिस। काम नेट नियम में मानता हूँ। 224 को मैं पूरी तरह मानता हूँ।—एक ही क्वेश्चन के बारे में आप

पाच नाटिन मेरे श्याम बाबू के, अटल जी के, ज्योतिर्वंश बसु जी के आपने मुने इसी के बारे में। नया काननेट नोटिस आया और यह चार्ज शीट में निकला है। प्रश्न एक ही है। आपका निर्णय मानेंगे। लेकिन हमें लगता है कि एक माथ लेने में फायदा होगा। मिनिस्टस को मुनने के पहले हमें मुनेंगे तो समय बचेगा। वहाँ हमारा क्या जाता है, फिर रिगमेराल शुरू हो जाएगा।

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय आध मिनट इनकी बात सुन लूँ, फिर आपकी तरफ आता हूँ। इनको अपना केस खत्म कर लेने दीजिये।

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह ने समझते हैं कि हम लोग कुछ पढ़े लिखे नहीं हैं। इकीकत यह है कि हम लागू भी गत और नैवारी करके आते हैं। लेकिन आप मौका ही नहीं देते हैं। हमें बँठे रहना पड़ता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय इतके बाद मैं आपकी तरफ आ रहा हूँ।

SHRI JYOTIRMO Y BOSU Sir, I invite your attention to rule 224, sub-rules (ii) and (iii). Sub-rule (ii) clearly says that "the question shall be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence" Now for argument's sake, if I waited for three or four days, the purpose would not have been served especially when sub-rule (iii) says that "the matter requires the intervention of the House"

So, tell me, would there be any other matter so very important as this one which requires the intervention of the House or which does not require the intervention of the House?

Is there any other matter more important than this?

This is my submission, and you, Sir as Speaker of the House, may kindly take this in to consideration and allow my privilege motion.

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह : नियम सख्या 222 के अन्तर्गत सब से पहले सदन में प्रिविलेज मॉशन इन मामलों में उठाया। गंज इनके इतने अधिक मॉशन आते हैं कि हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं। इन्होंने नियम सख्या 222 के अनुसार इसको उठाया है। हमारे मार्था श्री स्टिफज ने 376 के अन्तर्गत बाइट आफ आर्डर रज किया है। इन्होंने कहा है कि 224 के अन्तर्गत एक बार में एक ही उठाया जा सकता है प्रिविलेज मॉशन। मैं शकधर और कील को काट करना चाहता हूँ। मैं उस मोटी पुस्तक को बराबर साथ ले कर नहीं चलता हूँ। उस में से नोट कर लेता हूँ। उसके पृष्ठ 925 पर यह लिखा हुआ है कि जब सदस्य व्यवस्था का प्रश्न रखता है तो अध्यक्ष यह फैसला करना है कि वह प्रश्न व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है या नहीं और इस सम्बन्ध में अध्यक्ष का निर्णय अन्तिम होता है। आपन श्री स्टिफज के व्यवस्था के प्रश्न का माता और रलिंग दे दिया। आपका रलिंग अन्तिम रलिंग होता है। उसके बाद बहस की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। इसलिए आपन जब बड़ा वि एक बार एक ही प्रिविलेज मॉशन रखा जा सकता है सदन के सामने तो इसको मान लेना चाहिये। श्री नियमों में जो उठाया है प्रिविलेज मॉशन वह हमारे सामने है। इस पर बहस की गुंजाइश कहा है। इसलिए आप रलिंग दे कि जो हमारे सामने प्रिविलेज मॉशन है उस पर हम विचार करें जिस पर आप रलिंग दे चुके हैं उन पर बाहस नहीं होनी चाहिये, उसकी गुंजाइश नहीं है।

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT (East Delhi): Sir, I am raising a point of order, and I request you to give a ruling on this. We all got up in this House the other day, and today also we are getting up. How, kindly see rule 376 relating to points of order. Each one gets up in this House

[Shri H. K. L. Bhagat]

as did Mr. Madhu Limaye twice. Some other friends raised points of order. We want you to consider these points of order. I should like to draw your attention to sub-rule 2 of rule 376 where it says that a point of order can be raised in relation to the business of the House. Either some business is on the agenda or you have permitted it to come up. What happened now? Before you had taken up the agenda item before you had considered the matter, people raise points of order it has become a mantra to go against the rules. Point of order is being used to indulge in defamation, to create disorder in the House.

It is used to make allegations it is used to supercede the business. He tried to bring in an interesting argument. When the question of breach of privilege has to be considered, it is a specific thing; specific evidence and specific arguments should be given against the specified person. My friend, Mishra says that it relates to the same matter but all the same it is a different specific matter. General discussion is one thing. But a privilege motion is a specific motion relating to a specific person in regard to a specific point they should adduce specific evidence. Therefore, I am saying that you must first give your ruling your considered ruling whether most of the points raised particularly by the Opposition Members, are not misuse of the provision about point of order to create disorder in the House. I want your ruling on this. Unless an item is there before the House, no point of order can be raised.

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY (Raiganj) : In all humility may I seek a clarification from you? We have been sitting here for the last 45 minutes listening to various points of order, I do not claim to have more intelligence than the other hon. members of the House. In fact I admit my intelligence is extremely low, but if my understanding is correct, you have given a ruling just now in answer to Mr. Stephen's point of order.

If my understanding is correct you have said that no new motion could be raised during the pendency of the continuing one. So your ruling stands. We are prepared to accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, Sir, whether we agree with it or not, is not any importance. It is your ruling; and you have given that ruling and it must stand (Interruptions)

SHRI PILOO MODI (Godhra): There seems to be a great deal of confusion whether a ruling on the point of order raised by Mr. Stephen has been given or not. My submission is that a ruling has not been given... (interruptions). I have never heard of ruling in any House of parliament which ends with a question, aimed particularly at the Opposition. That is how your ruling ended. Kindly check up the records, or otherwise check yourself, whatever you like. That is how the ruling ended asking the opposition a question. We were all in the process of answering that question.

MR. SPEAKER: That is a good way you have found. You did not understand it and that is why you are answering it.

SHRI PILOO MODY: So far as the question of understanding or the level of understanding is concerned

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY: Sir, may I point out....

SHRI PILOO MODY: Maya, I will give you your turn. or, If you want now, I will yield.

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन में किसी भी सदस्य को इस प्रकार चुकारने की व्यवस्था नहीं है। यहाँ हर एक सदस्य को आनरेवल कह कर बुलाया जाता है। माननीय सदस्य का यह तरीका ठीक नहीं है।

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to inform him ..

SHRI PILOO MODI: Sir, I have yielded only to Maya and not to you.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I will yield to any lady in the House. But as far as I know, you are known as "Mr Speaker" as against "Madam Prime Minister".

SHRIMATI MAYA RAY: There is a little story about a Brahman and a Brahmani. One day the brahmani came and announced that if anybody could explain the *Bhagavadgita* to her, she will give him half her property. When she came home she found her husband in a terrible state of mind. He immediately asked her "tell me my dear what have you done? You have offered half our property to someone who can explain the *Bhagavadgita*? Somebody might come and be able to explain the *Bhagavadgita*; that is so very easily done." She replied: "my dear husband, why do you worry? They can certainly explain to me as to what the *Bhagavadgita* is. But whether I understand it or not is upto me, and I shall never understand".

SHRI PILOO MODY: That was typical of the Congress story; ending with the dishonesty of women. What the brahman should have said to the brahmani was, "I will explain the *Bhagavadgita* to you" so that he could keep the property with the family.

Now, to continue with more serious work instead of these little stories which we all enjoy, coming back to the point of order.

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAMMA (Khammam) Sir on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Will you kindly listen to him? I am not so circumspect. Kindly sit down. You should not exploit his generosity. When he did it in one case, he should do it in your case also. Kindly do not do it, because he has yielded in one case.

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAMMA: So far we were thinking that only Shri Charan Singh is antagonistic to women. Now are we to understand that Shri Pilo Mody is also following him?

SHRI PILOO MODY: I do not know whether Charan Singh is against women or her leader is against men looking to these women she has collected around her. Even Shri Borooah agrees with me when he said that the Prime Minister was the only *admi* in the party.

AN HON. MEMBER. Male.

Shri Pilo Mody: I suppose *admi* means a male, a brahmin, a *maid*.

MR. SPEAKER: I am just helpless, watching the fight between women and Shri Pilo Mody. Why both of you are going astray? Why don't you keep to the point?

SHRI PILOO MODY: Just as Mr. Stephen gets excited when he sees the Prime Minister, I get excited when I see the hon. lady Member, Shrimati Maya Ray. (Shrimati Sahodrabai Rai rose—). If she also wants to say something, I am prepared to yield to her.

MR. SPEAKER: You need not do it in her case.

ग्राम देखिए, यह क्या मजाक है ? अब छोड़िए इस को । जो बान चल रही है उस को खत्म करने दीजिए । ग्राम भी मेहरबानी कर के अपने को प्वाइंट ग्राम गार्ड तक रखिए ।

SHRI VASANT SATHE: He is on a point of humour, not on a point of order.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I was saying, when I was so pleasantly interrupted, that the point of order that Mr. Stephen raised on which you said something, which ended with a question, which the educated Members of the Congress Benches have taken to be a ruling and which we, here, not being educated thought was a question, ended without a ruling because, after that, another point of order was allowed to be raised by an hon. Member from there. Therefore, I consider, when one point of order was not disposed of or was left in suspended animation and you allowed another point

[Shri Pilloo Mody]

of order, we can make submissions only on the second point of order. We cannot make any more submission on the first point of order. The first point of order died without a ruling.

Now, the second point of order that was made was really no point of order at all. He kept on saying that the "point of order" instrument is being used for various purposes. I would say, all the institutions of Government and Parliament itself, all the institutions of democracy, are also being used as flippantly as he may allege that the Members of the Opposition are using the instrument of "point of order". Therefore, on that, I have to make a submission that when you have done all this to the country, merely a misuse of "point of order" cannot be any serious crime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : May I repeat it again that we have already one privilege motion before us and, as I said, unless that is disposed of, we will not take up the other one. In the meanwhile, because Mr. Vajpayee said, if it is not a new one, if it is just a continuation of the same one, and they all could be taken together, I put it to you that they are all identical and, therefore, they could be taken up together in the form of one privilege motion. Mr. Limaye must be aware that when all of them came, he also agreed...

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : It was a different privilege motion.

MR. SPEAKER : I put it to you very categorically and you said that they all be amalgamated in one and taken up.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : All offenders cannot be taken in the same manner. The offenders are different. Breach of privilege is committed by different persons.

MR. SPEAKER : Now we are already seized of one and I have said that, so long as that is pending, unless we dispose that of, we cannot take up another one.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : Do not take it up for discussion, but take notice of it.

MR. SPEAKER : Unless the first is disposed of, we cannot take it up. Not now. We are already discussing one. We shall take it up later. It will not be a healthy practice. . .

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : This is to be taken notice of; it may be taken up later. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (*Srinagari*) : You have said that we are already seized of a privilege motion and that we cannot take note of another privilege motion. Suppose, when we are discussing a privilege motion, somebody from the Gallery throws leaflets. Do we not take notice of that? (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER : We are already seized of one and it must be disposed of before we take up another.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAJAYEE : Rule 224(i) says ; 'Not more than one question shall be raised at the same sitting'

MR. SPEAKER : How can I put another when we are already seized of one ?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAJAYEE : You can allow us to raise it.

MR. SPEAKER : That will be pending.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज अग्न कोई मामला होगा जो हम उस के बारे में पात्र नहीं नोटिस दे सकने हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : एक कम प्रान्सेडी डिस्कस हो रहा है ।

We are already seized of this. How can I put another one ?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : By the same token—since it is a matter of procedure—if any contempt is committed in the House, shall we not take up that issue ?

MR. SPEAKER : We are already seized of one. We are already discussing one. How can we introduce another one ? It will not come unless the first one is disposed of. Later on, we shall see. Let the first one be disposed of.

The Law Minister.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : इस में पहले कि आप विधि मंत्री को बोलने के लिए कहें. इस आप में यह जानना चाहते हैं कि होम मिनिस्टर न सा वा साई की रिपोर्ट के बारे में जो आप की गारंटेज मांगी थी उस के बारे में आप का फैसला क्या है ?

श्री ज्योतिबंस बसु : डिप्टी स्पीकर माहब के मामले में न हाउस की रूलिंग कांट किया

that the House cannot abdicate its power; the House must sit on judgment; the House is supreme.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उन्होंने जो रिपोर्ट आप का भेजी है—क्या वह एक रिपोर्ट है या कई रिपोर्ट है रिलेवेन्ट रिपोर्ट या क्या मतलब है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले इन को बैठाइये, तब जवाब दूंगा ।

13 hrs.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : I have written to you. You will remember that on Friday we had to forego the right and privilege of discussing non-official business. This matter continued upto 6-30, regarding the Privilege Motion

against Home Minister as also laying of the report. (An hon. Member: Reports), yes, reports of the CBI on the Table of the House. This is an important point, Sir. The Whole House was seized of the matter. Naturally, the first item after Question Hour should have been this item, on which the House was seized of the matter already. We have given notice. Today is Monday; if something is remaining, it will be taken up on Tuesday. On that basis we have given clear information. But today what we find is that the same thing is not given as the second item after Question Hour. The second item should have been the issue of privilege that was discussed by the House upto 6-30 P. M. on the day. Are you going to pull up the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs why it cannot be included, I want to know.

AN HON. MEMBER : Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is not concerned.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपना मवाल फिर दोहरा दू ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उस दिन गृह मंत्री महोदय ने विवाद के बीच में मदन को यह जानकारी दी थी कि उन्होंने आप को पत्र लिखा है और वे उस के बारे में आप का मार्गदर्शन चाहते हैं । वह पत्र बाद में यहाँ पहुँच कर बताया गया । अब आप को निर्णय करना है, उन्होंने सारी जिम्मेदारी आप पर डाल दी है । वह कहते हैं—“रिलेवेन्ट रिपोर्ट”—तो क्या उन्होंने वह रिपोर्ट आप को भेज दी है ? यदि रिपोर्ट भेजी है तो क्या वह रिलेवेन्ट है, एक रिपोर्ट है या कई रिपोर्ट है ? उन्होंने एक रिपोर्ट भेजी है या कई रिपोर्ट भेजी है—उन के बारे में आप का फैसला क्या है ? मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन प्रश्नों के बारे में आप सदन को जानकारी दीजिये, उस के बाद हम विधि

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

मन्त्री जी को सुनिये। उन से मुझे भी एक सवाल पूछना है, इन प्रश्नों का जवाब आने के बाद पूछूंगा।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : How long are we go to on like this ?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : All of you may kindly sit down.

The other day, that letter came to me. I allowed it to be circulated also and I think you have got it.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is in the proceedings....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It was read out here.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : It is in the Bulletin also.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes. And then I addressed the Minister in the evening. I said, you mentioned some relevant report, on what points you need my clarification. And he sent it. My Secretary told me that at about 10 o'clock this came. This was received at midnight at my residence.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISIRA : On Saturday ?

MR. SPEAKER : Friday night.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : All the reports ?

MR. SPEAKER : Why are you impatient ?

I must of course inform you of it. I left at about 5 A.M. for Chandigarh on Saturday.

I could not go through it. But it was known as Part I. When I saw that I thought perhaps the Minister did not get my letter which I addressed to him on Friday evening.

Meanwhile, I got the information from my Private Secretary that his Secretary had informed that the Minister was out of

Delhi and he is expected to be here on Monday. When I enquired about the other part of the report. I was told he will give it to me on Monday, that is, part II and whatever it is. He brought it to me at 10:30 A.M. with some documents along with some forwarding note also. I have not seen that as yet. Even the first one is a very long one.

श्री अशु लिमये : इस का अध्ययन करने में मैं आप की मदद करूँ, क्योंकि आप को समय नहीं मिल रहा है। मैं बिलकुल फैव-फली मसूरी बना कर दूंगा।

MR. SPEAKER : I need not get your help on such a delicate matter.

श्री अशु लिमये : कभी कभी ले लिया करे।

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : प्रिन्सिपल कमेटी की मदद ले लीजिये, वे टय डाक्यूमेंट को पूरी तरह से देख लेंगे।

MR. SPEAKER : So far as its laying on the Table is concerned, he asks the Speaker as to whether this will prejudice the judicial proceedings or not, ask me as to which part of the proceedings it will prejudice and then he will form an opinion. I really wonder is it the job of the Speaker to form an opinion. I do not think it is my function to decide as to which part of the report will prejudice the court and which not. Courts are there. Putting the Speaker in such a delicate situation that he may express some judicial opinion on it.....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISIRA : Reputation of the House and the Members of the House is more delicate.

MR. SPEAKER : I have no objection if they want to lay on the Table. They are welcome to do it. To ask me to decide whether it will prejudice the proceedings and which will not prejudice the

proceedings, I am not in a position to say anything I do not want to come in the picture. If they are willing, they are welcome to do so but do not get my opinion on it I have made it very clear Now, let us hear the Law Minister

SHRI H. N. MUKHERJEE (Calcutta-North-East) Sir, you have raised the fundamental question as to what exact ly you should do with the document sent to you In the 17th century in England Speaker Lenthall made a memorable statement which everybody cherishes namely that Speaker has neither eyes to see nor ears to hear except what is given to him by the House You can only study the report if the House is taken into confidence You have to go through the documents with the assistance, I submit, of whatever Committee you may choose But the fact of the matter is that unless some subterranean processes are in operation these documents in the possession of the Speaker have to be studied by the Speaker, which he can do only through the eyes of the House I submit therefore, Sir since the document has come in to your possession that for solving the delicate and difficult question you have to take the House into confidence.

श्री मधु लिखये : अध्यक्ष महोदय—

अध्यक्ष महोदय . इस पर वहम न कीजिये ।

श्री मधु लिखये : मैं आप के विचारार्थ एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आप न गरी जिम्मेदारी फिर सरकार पर छोड़ दी है—आप ने ठीक ही किया है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर यह सिर्फ एक मेम्बर का ही तो ठीक है । लेकिन साथ इस के और बहुत से व्यक्ति जुड़े हुए हैं जो दायम फेम करेंगे ।

श्री मधु लिखये : सब-जुडिस वा काई प्राउड नदी बन सकना है । (व्यवधान)

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA Sir, the privilege motion is not subject to the rule of *sub-judice*

MR SPEAKER My observations have nothing to do with the matter under discussion and also whether it is *sub-judice* or not

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA Your pronouncement must be clear and decisive With regard to the privilege motion, the highest court is the House And there is no question of rule of *sub-judice* We have got our own rules

MR SPEAKER After hearing I shall express my views

SHRI SAMAR GUHA Sir, I rise on a point of order I want to draw the attention of the House (*Interruptions*)

MR SPEAKER You have already spoken

SHRI SAMAR GUHA Whether it is *sub-judice* or not you will kindly remember—the whole House should remember—the the whole licence scandal issue came up before the house and it was discussed The whole House was seized of it, the Home Minister also made a statement about it and reported that during the inter-session the Government went to the court when the whole matter was seized by the House and when this was the property of the House How can this become *sub-judice* now the the matter was taken to the court How can they take it to the court before it could be discussed in the House? And how can you call it *sub-judice*?

Perhaps you could have thought over it whether it was *sub-judice* or not. But, it was a matter before the House and it was discussed by the House not once but twice

MR SPEAKER May I now request you to please sit down?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: How can you come to the conclusion? The matter is taken to the court and make it *sub-judice* only to prevent the House from discussing it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, I have written to you on Saturday giving you the facts about the C.B.I. report which comes up before the House. In support of my contention, what I have written now is this which I want to make clear.

In May's Parliamentary Practice, it is clearly stated that the issue of misconduct of Members or the Officer of either House as such and corrupting any executive Officer or Member would be a breach of privilege. It would be a breach of privilege for a Member to enter into an agreement with another person for a sum of rupees to defend him.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bosu, you have already spoken on it. Why do you speak second time?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, Mr Deputy-Speaker had stated on the 31st August 1974.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr Bosu, you have already spoken on it several times.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No, Sir. The Law Minister also has made a statement. The Deputy-Speakersaid:

"We are concerned with certain Members of Parliament having exercised or alleged to have exercised certain things 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 machinery outside the House. This is the question which, I feel, involves this Parliament and this is a matter which ought to be considered very deeply. and I would consider that this has to be looked into in that light".

What did you say on 28th August, 1974 on page 12919?

MR. SPEAKER: It is already before the House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: In your wisdom.

MR. SPEAKER: Everybody knows it and you need not read it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSE: You said:

"If some people go to the extent of getting even forged or fictitious signatures, we have to go into the matter thoroughly."

Sir, an assurance was given by the Home Minister and the Law Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: You will kindly sit down. I am not allowing you. Please sit down.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष जी, गृह मंत्री महोदय यह बता दे कि क्या सी० बी० आई० की रिपोर्ट आने के बाद अदालत में जाने का फैसला सरकार ने कानून मंत्री की राय से किया है? क्या उन से मलाह ली गई थी, और उन की मलाह क्या थी?

SHRI PILOO MODY: One minute.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You have called the Law Minister. He should speak. Nobody should ask for one minute now.

MR. SPEAKER: May I request Shri Mody to wait.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Unless the Law Minister yields nobody can speak.

MR. SPEAKER: May I request Shri Mody to wait for some time? Let the Law Minister speak.

SHRI PILOO MODI: Then it would be redundant, because he is going to give the Government's point of view in this matter. If he is going to give his own point of view, it is even worse. Is he speaking as Law Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: Four or five of you had spoken. I had fixed for the Law Minister to speak after that. Shri Mody can avail of some other time.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Will you allow me to speak after him?

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE): You have called me to reply to the breach of privilege motion. . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: He says he wants to reply to some of the points? He is here in the dock as an offender.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: Nobody is in the dock.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: . . . Let him know.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I am entitled to deal with the privilege motion against me. He has not heard me completely. Each before I had said two or three words, he gets up.

You have called on me to deal with the breach of privilege motion moved against me—That was what I was going to say—by the hon. member, Shri Madhu Limaye. I want to confine myself to that breach of privilege motion against me.

I recollect that in the last session I spoke on this matter four times, on the 3rd, 4th, 5th and 9th. In the motion of privilege which has been moved by the hon. member, he has quoted some remarks made by me on the 9th. They are no doubt remarks, but what I am going to say is— I am not disowning those remarks—that these are remarks made by me which the hon. member has quoted with reference to the debate, the last day of it, on the 9th September. My point is that no particular remark can be considered in isolation when one subject matter was discussed as a whole and I had spoken on this matter more than once. I have spoken more than once and made it clear that if the matter

disclosed that some crimes had been committed and the offenders are identified, the only course open to the Government, the legitimate course open to the Government, is to book them in the court of law, I have said this not once but more than once.

Now reference was made by one hon. member to my speech on the 5th September. But unfortunately, he preferred to omit a very pertinent remark to which I am referring, and read some other remark torn out of its context. On the 5th September I said this:

“I need hardly assure this House that the Government is as much concerned with the dignity and respect of the members of this house and of the Parliament as a whole, as indeed all the members of this House are, including the hon. members of the Opposition. That is why the Government set in motion much earlier the inquiry by the CBI, and a preliminary verification report has been received. As I had occasion to mention in this case on the basis of that report”—

Now this important—

“it appeared that some offence seemed to have been committed and that the offences had been registered as offences and a proper investigation into the criminal offences is in progress”.

“As a result of the investigation, if there is enough material to establish that these offences have been committed and it is possible to identify the offenders also, I have no doubt that no efforts will be spared to see that the offenders are brought to book in a court of law.”

This is what I said on the 5th September. But this was not the first time or the last time that I said. (Interruption) Just a minute. On the 3rd September, on the very first day on which I intervened also, I had made this position very clear, in my brief intervention on that day. This is what I said:

[Shri H. R. Gokhale]

“Sir, we are of opinion or submit it for the consideration of this House, that in a matter where *prima facie* criminal offences are involved, that requires investigation and proper action and, if necessary, prosecution in a court of law.”

Therefore, I did not mince words in saying that if offences are disclosed to have been committed and it appears on the investigation that certain offences are committed and the offenders are also possible to be identified, the proper thing to do is to haul them before the court of law. These remarks were isolated from the other statement which I made and which alone was read by the hon. Member while dealing with this matter. I have said that the House will be taken into confidence on the results of the investigation. Now, that has been done, I submit, because the hon. Home Minister had the first opportunity—*(Interruption)*.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Dishonesty. *(Interruptions)* it is dishonesty. it is grossly dishonest.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: They are saying “offenders,” “prosecutors” and they have become judges in their own cause. It is not for them to decide. It is for you, ultimately, to consider, after hearing all of us, as to what is the correct position. It is no use using words like “offenders”, “guilty” and so on. Nobody has been found guilty.

There is an allegation of a breach of privilege, and it is the normal rule of natural justice that everyone concerned should have an opportunity to explain. And that is what I am doing, and giving any judgment of this kind, that this is dishonest or that is dishonest is absolutely not proper. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER: What are you doing? Please do not interrupt him.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: When it is inconvenient for them, they use superlative

words like dishonest and all that. Therefore, my submission, first of all, is that there was no assurance given in my speech on any of the four days that the CBI report would be placed—*(Interruption)*— You need not read out. I know everything. Now I am on my legs and I am not yielding.

MR. SPEAKER: He is not yielding. Do not interrupt him.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I did not interrupt the hon. Members even once when they were speaking. I am entitled to a hearing. It is my right as a Member to explain to you and to the House as to why no question of breach of privilege arises so far as the motion of Shri Madhu Limaye is concerned. *(Interruption)*.

In that context, I said that only a part of the speech, torn out of its context, was mentioned. And if all the speeches together, were gone into—everytime it was a brief intervention I did not make any long speech at any time and every time a brief intervention was made—it will be found that I emphasised that if crimes are seen to have committed, found to have been committed, and if the offenders are identified, the Government is of the opinion that the proper form is the court of law. I said that the Government will take the House into confidence, which meant that the results of the investigations will be intimated to the House which, I submit, has been done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, a point of order.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, are you allowing him to raise a point of order, when the hon. Minister is speaking and is not yielding?

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I have not yielded.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Sir, my point of order is this. He said just now that the results of the CBI investigations will be intimated to the House. I want to know whether it is a fact. The CBI report has not been placed on the Table of the house.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: Certain passages were quoted. There was picking and choosing of certain passages. That is what I said, and that is what the hon. Member who has moved this motion has done in his notice to you, whereas the relevant portion to which I have referred has not been referred to at all. We have been saying all along that the proper course where the investigation of a matter dealing with criminal offence is concerned will be before the court of law. That is the position which I have made clear repeatedly in the House in the course of my speeches in the last session. I should submit that you cannot look at this sentence or that sentence and say: you have given an assurance. I have given no such assurance that the CBI report would be placed on the Table of the House. I may also submit that the CBI report is part of the investigation process and such reports are never placed before the House. . . . (Interruption).

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot call all of you together.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने इनको जानबूझ कर इंटरप्ट नहीं किया। जबाब देते वक्त उन्होंने बहुत सारे पैसेजिज पढ़े जिनका हमने जो मुद्दा रखा है उससे कोई रिलेवेंस नहीं है। कोर्ट में जाएगा, सजा देंगे छोड़ देंगे या नहीं, क्या होगा, इस सब से उसका कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। मैं धीरे धीरे उनके तीन पैसेजिज पढ़ता हूँ।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : How is it a point of order ?

MR. SPEAKER: He has not yet put it,

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What is it ? Under rule 376 a Member who raises a point of order must first say under which rule it comes ? What is rule 376 ? A Member must formulate his point of order subject to conditions referred to in sub-rules 1 and 2. Sub-rule 1 says that a point of order shall relate to the interpretation or enforcement of these rules or such articles of the Constitution as regulate the business of the House and shall raise a question which is within the cognisance of the Speaker. The second sub-rule says that a point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment, provided that the Speaker may permit a Member to raise a point of order during the interval between the termination of one item and the commencement of the next item.

MR. SPEAKER: He has not started yet.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Subject to the conditions referred to in sub rule 1 and 2 a Member may formulate a point of order and the Speaker shall decide whether it is point of order and if so give his decision thereon. While raising a point of order will you allow a Member to read 3 or 4 pages and allow him one hour or half an hour to speak and then formulate his point of order ? Is that the understanding of formulating a point of order ? He must first say which rule or which article of the Constitution is violated. Otherwise you cannot allow point of order to be raised. Because you relax the rule and you allow this plethora of points of order to be raised, this thing happens. There is a flood gate which is opened. That is why they make nonsense of the whole point of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं केवल तीन पैसेजिज और दो तीन वाक्य अपने बोल कर खत्म करूंगा। गोखले साहब ने 5-9-74 को क्या कहा ? कोई कानटेक्सट—से निकाल कर नहीं कोट किया गया है। दोनों का विषय अलग है। कोर्ट में जाएंगे क्या करेंगे वह अलग है। उन्होंने यह कहा था।

[Shri Madhu Limaye]

"The CBI has been instructed to expedite the inquiry and to complete it as early as possible. I also want to mention this. I do not want to say that the Government alone will look at the results of the CBI inquiry."

Kindly note the words "Government alone will look at the results of the CBI enquiry".

"I want to assure the House that when the results of the CBI investigations are known, the Government will take the House into confidence and, at that stage, it will be proper for Parliament, for the House, to consider as to what appropriate steps are to be taken for protecting the rights of the hon. Member."

The second passage is :

"The Government have said that they are having an inquiry by the CBI and that the matter could be considered after the preliminary facts have been gathered, after the investigation is over."

तीसरा पैसेज 9 तारीख का है। यह उन के इन्टरव्यू में से है, जो उन्होंने स्वेच्छा से किया।

"Please refer to my remarks. I have said at that time that we shall take the house into confidence after the investigation report was available. After the results of the investigations are available, we shall take the House into confidence. The whole matter is open to the House to consider at that stage."

मैं केवल दो तीन जुमले कहना चाहता हूँ—आध घंटे की बात नहीं है। क्या उन्होंने स्वेच्छा से सदन को विश्वास में लिया? हम ने 11 तारीख को इन्तजार किया। 12 तारीख को नोटिसिज् गये और तब उन का जवाब आया। लेकिन चार्जशीट फिर भी नहीं मिला—वह आप के डायरेक्शन के बाद मिला सी०बी०आई० की रिपोर्ट का मामला

अभी उलझा हुआ है। इस से प्रकट है कि उन्होंने हम को विश्वास में नहीं लिया।

उन का व्यवहार और आचरण बिल्कुल डिसऑर्डली है, जिस के बारे में रूल पड़ा गया है। ये उल्टे हम को डांट रहे हैं। जब हम रिकार्ड को पढ़ते हैं, तो कहते हैं कि वह आउट ऑफ कानटेक्ट है। इस वक्त मैं मेरिट्स में नहीं जा रहा हूँ, लेकिन उन के डिसऑर्डली बिहेवियर के लिए उन को डांटा जाये।

SHRI C.M. STEPHEN: What is the point of order?

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: That he is disorderly.

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT: Once the Law Minister made a statement Shri Madhu Limaye has raised a point of order and referred to all those matter again and started accusing the Law Minister. It is very amazing. What the Law Minister has stated clearly shows that he has never said that he will choose this particular course of action. The Law Minister only said that the results of the investigation will be placed before the House and this House can go into that question. The result of the investigation has been placed before the House... (Interruptions) I want to make a further submission. As a matter of fact, in legal terminology in terms of section 173 of the Criminal Procedure Code even the report of the CBI has already been placed on the Table of the House, because the names of the accused, the gist of the charges and the summary of the evidence have been placed before the House. What else are they asking for when the CBI report has already been placed on the Table of the House? (Interruptions) Probably, they do not know the meaning of the word "report". I would respectfully submit this House is bound by the laws passed by this House. In accordance with the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, who is entitled to see the first information report and the statements of the witnesses? it is only the accused. In fact, section 162 completely bars any other use

when it says that it shall be used only for a particular purpose, namely, for contradicting the witness when he comes in the witness box. What are our friends here asking us? They are suggesting that we must throw the Evidence Act and the Criminal Procedure Code in the wastepaper basket. This is a document which cannot be used for any purpose other than for the prosecution of the case because then it will hamper the investigation and it will go against the accused; it will be against the fundamental principles of criminal Jurisprudence (*Interruption*). The Law Minister has given the correct legal position and the Government have acted according to the law. In the name of Report, they are asking for something which nobody, under the law, can give them. Even an investigating officer cannot be compelled by court to refresh his memory from any entries regarding any of his investigation notes.

So, what I am submitting is that it is not a point of order. He was only trying to confuse the hon. Minister which he could not do.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Vajpayee.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विधि मंत्री महोदय ने मेरे सीधे प्रश्न का उत्तर नहीं दिया कि क्या सी.बी.आई. की जाच के बाद ...

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Berul) Are we having a debate on this? Are we not bound by the Rules of Procedure under the Chapter "Privilege"? (*Interruptions*) I am raising a basic issue

MR. SPEAKER : He is also on a point of order.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE Under what Rule are we having it?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अभी हम ने श्री भगन को मुना। क्या वह पायट आफ द्राईंग था? वह भाषण कर रहे थे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी उन्होंने शुरू नहीं किया है। आप उन्हें प्री-जज कर रहे हैं।

श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार साखे मेरा निवेदन है कि हमें एक व्यवस्था, एक प्रोसीजर के अनुसार चलना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अभी श्री भगत भी पायट आफ द्राईंग पर ही थे।

SHIRI N K P. SALVE : I am seeking your guidance on procedure

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप लोग हर बात पर मेरी गाइडेंस मांगते हैं। कभी आप अपनी गाइडेंस भी लिया करें। मुझे माननीय सदस्य को सुनने दीजिए।

You are a practising lawyer. If you do not speak before the court, do not even utter a word, and the court says, "No, you are not relevant" without listening to you, what would you say? He has just risen on a point of order.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं विधि मंत्री महोदय के इस कथन से सहमत हूँ कि वह विशेषाधिकार के उल्लंघन के दोषी हैं या नहीं, इस का निर्णय प्रतिपक्ष नहीं करेगा, जिस ने उन पर विशेषाधिकार के उल्लंघन का आरोप लगाया है। इस का निर्णय आप को करना है। लेकिन क्या आप विधि मंत्री के प्राश्चामन को टुकड़ों में देखने की गलती करेंगे? वह कहते हैं कि उन्होंने तीन दिन में तीन भाषण दिये। लेकिन वे परस्पर-विरोधी भाषण थे। श्रीखरी बहस हुई 9 मिनट्स को। जब मैं बहस का जवाब दे रहा था, ...

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : On a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : Let me first dispose of the first point of order. I will allow you later.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मेरा आरोप है कि विधि मंत्री ने भ्राप को गुमराह किया है। भ्राप कोई भी फँपला करने से पहले पूरी कार्यवाही को पढ़िये। मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ।

“श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे क्षमा कीजिए गृह मंत्री महोदय ने भ्राप जो भाषण दिया है, उस से मेरे मन में संदेह पैदा हो गया है कि अब श्री तुल मोहन राम को भी बचाया जाने वाला है।—मारा मामला पांच महीने का है, यह तथ्य हम बात को प्रमाणित करता है कि जिम मामले को लटकाना हो, उस को सी० बी० आई० को भेज दो। कुछ सदस्यों ने कहा अगर कोई प्राइमाफेसी केस नहीं है, तो संमदीय जांच बपा होगी। लेकिन विधि मंत्री महोदय कहते हैं कि प्राइमाफेसी केम है। मैं पूछना हूँ कि वह किम के खिलाफ है। श्री तुल मोहन राम उस में शामिल है कि नहीं? दूसरी मिनम्बर को जिम केप मे एफ०आई० आर० दाखिल की गई, वह किम के खिलाफ दाखिल की गई है?”

इस पर श्री मधु लिमये ने कहा :

“SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Let Mr. GOKHALE reply.”

श्रव गोखले ने साहब का जवाब सुनिए :

“SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I have already stated earlier that the persons have not been identified. They have to be identified during investigation which has started after the registration of the case.”

इस के बाद यह मामला उठा और मैंने यह आरोप लगाया, मैं उद्धृत कर रहा हूँ :

गृह मंत्री महोदय हम समय जो कुछ कह रहे हैं उस में और विधि मंत्री महोदय ने हम सदन में 3 तारीख को जो कुछ कहा उस में अन्तर्विरोध है। गृह मंत्री महोदय

मानते हैं कि सी० बी० आई० जांच करले तो मामला फिर पार्लियामेंट के सामने आ सकता है और अगर पार्लियामेंट उचित समझे तो कमेटी को मामला भेजा जा सकता है। लेकिन विधि मंत्री की राय इस के खिलाफ है। मैं ने उद्धृत किया। विधि मंत्री का कथन यह था :

“It is our view that these matters can be looked into only by a court of law. the proper agency, the statutory agency, that can investigate into the matter is the court.”

जब मैं ने यह उद्धृत किया और यह कहा कि गृह मंत्री कइ रहे हैं कि मामला जांच के बाद सदन के सामने आ सकता है उन्हींने यह भी कहा कि फिर सदन जो चाहे कुछ कर सकता है। मैं ने कहा कि विधि मंत्री का कहना है कि नहीं, मामला कोर्ट में जायेगा तो विधि मंत्री ने यह नहीं कहा कि हा, मेरा कहना ठीक है। विधि मंत्री खड़े हो गए और कहने लगे :

“Please refer to my remarks. I have said at that time that we shall take the House into confidence after the investigation report was available. After the results of investigation are available, we shall take the House into confidence the whole matter is open to the House to consider at that time.”

इस के लिए मैं ने सवाल पूछा था और जो मैं ने गवाना पूछा था उस का जवाब जरूरी है हम प्रिविजस ईश्य का निर्णय करने के लिए। क्या सरकार ने अदालत में जाने से पहले विधि मंत्री से सलाह ली? अगर विधि मंत्री ने सलाह दी कि अदालत में जाने बाइए तो विधि मंत्री अपने आग्रामन के उच्चरने के दोषी हैं और अगर सरकार ने विधि मंत्री की सलाह नहीं ली तो यह सरकार किम की सलाह से कोर्ट में गई?

11 तारीख को सदन की बैठक हुई ।
 ये 11 तारीख को सदन में क्यों नहीं आए ?
 क्या यह सदन की अवहेलना के दोषी नहीं हैं ?
 अभी भी विधि मंत्री, उस सवाल का जवाब नहीं दे रहे हैं जो मैंने पूछा था । अब विधि मंत्री कहते हैं कि मैंने 3 तारीख को एक भाषण दिया, 5 को एक भाषण दिया और 9 को एक भाषण दिया । मगर 9 का भाषण आखीर भाषण था । क्या विधि मंत्री हर एक दिन अलग अलग भाषण करेंगे ? मेरा निवेदन है कि कोर्ट में मामला जाने से इस सदन में मामले को आने से रोका नहीं जा सकता । जब तक हमें सी बी आई की रिपोर्ट नहीं मिलती विधि मंत्री कैसे कह सकते हैं कि सदन को विश्वास में लिया जा रहा है ? अगर हम मामले को नहीं उठाते तो यह चार्जशीट की कापी भी लाइब्रेरी में नहीं रखते । अगर हम मामला नहीं उठाते तो सी बी आई की जांच के परिणामों से भी हमें अवगत नहीं करते । विधि मंत्री का आश्वासन तभी पूरा हो सकता है जब सी बी आई की जांच की रिपोर्ट आए, नहीं तो वे विशेषाधिकार उल्लंघन के दोषी हैं और इस संबंध में आप को निर्णय करना है ।

The Minister of Works and Housing and Parliamentary Affairs (Shri K. Raghu Ramiah) : Before you proceed further, Sir, I would like to point out that we have got one more Minister who has to be heard.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : On a point of order.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : I rise on a point of order. My point is very simple. Now what is going on in this House, as I understand, is

the question whether the notice given about privilege must be adjudged by you as admissible or not. On that you have heard the persons who had given notice and also the persons on the other side. The point that I am raising is this. The reply has been given. It is an elementary rule that nobody has got the right to speak on a subject-matter more than once. He has explained the position; the reply has been given. Now there cannot be another speech again and then a reply to that, another speech and then a reply to that and so on. This is an extraordinary procedure. Under what rule is it permissible? My submission is that they had their full say and the reply also has been given. Now the ruling must come from you. Nobody has got the right to make a speech again and ask for a reply. No more speeches should be permitted. If you permit them, then speeches must be permitted from all sides. My submission is that this is not permissible. (*Interruptions*). They speak for half an hour and when I print out something in a few minutes, why do they get excited? This I cannot understand. Rule 222 is an extraordinary procedure. The person who gives notice may address you either in your Chamber or in the House, and if that comes, the person incriminated against, must have a right of reply. It is a well understood convention and practice that the incriminated person must be given the right of reply. Are we to say that the other person will not have the right of reply? So, therefore, my submission is, this is not what has been contemplated; it is not to be permitted. That is my submission.

So far as the substantial part of this matter is concerned, it is said some assurance is given, it has been contraverted and so on. It is a well accepted concept and I am reading this out to you from *Kaul and Shakdher* :

'Non-implementation of an assurance given by a Minister on the the floor

Shri C. M. Stephen]
of the House is neither a breach of privilege nor a contempt of the House for the process of implementation of a policy matter is conditional on a number of factors contributing to such policy".

The only thing they base their argument on is that the assurance was not carried out and the circumstances under which that assurance was not carried out has been spelt out from this side. In the matter of Government assurances, you have got the Government Assurances Committee. It can go before that Committee. And the rule is, even after going through the Government Assurance Committee, it is never discussed in this House. That is the convention. The explanation is given how it has not been possible to conform to those things. That is what happens. My simple point of order is this, whether a Member has got right to speak more than once on that point. It is a well-established convention and a provision under the rules that on a motion nobody has right of floor more than once. That being so, at the stage at which the motion is not even moved, nobody can have right of speech more than once. For Privilege proceedings it is well established convention that if the Speaker chooses to hear the complainant he may be heard in the open House and that the incriminated person must be given the right of reply. After that the complainant cannot have another right of reply, because, in that case the incriminated person must get a further right of reply and this will go on *ad infinitum*. This is the point I am raising. The incriminated person alone has got the right of reply. This is my submission.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : My point of order is this. You have to address yourself to three questions....

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : I am challenging his right for another 10 or 15 minutes; please give me a ruling, either you allow that or not.

MR. SPEAKER : Let me listen to him. How can I shut him out when he says, point of order ?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : May I ask you : Is it another point of order or is it his own opinion on the point of order I have raised ? If it is another point of order, I submit, your ruling on my point of order must naturally precede before another point of order is heard by you. I have raised the point of order. Please give reply to that point of order raised by me.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr Stephen, let me hear him.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I do not mind your listening to hundreds of points of order; that is within rules. The rule says : No debate shall be allowed on a point of order; the Speaker may, if he thinks fit, hear Members, before giving his decision. You are very right, Sir. All that you should do is when one point of order is raised and you want to listen to others before giving decision you do it but after that decide that point of order. Give a ruling once that point of order is disposed of. Let another point of order be raised but before you decide that you do not allow the Member to say I rise on a point of order. You cannot decide all together.

MR. SPEAKER : I have just noted the points of order of Mr. Stephen, Mr. Bhagat and others.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH : There is one more Minister who has been waiting for the last three days according to the direction. Why don't you hear him and finish with it.

SHRI PILOO MODY : Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting for ten days to get the report. All that you have to do is to put the report on the Table. Till the report is placed on the Table you are bound to get not one, not one hundred but hundred thousand points of order.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA :

The Point for you to decide is whether the results of the investigation as promised earlier have been placed before the House. The point for you to decide is whether the matter is still open for consideration by the House as the hon. Law Minister said to the House earlier he is saying he has fulfilled his commitment or assurances. Therefore it is for you to decide whether the matter is still open for consideration by the House or not. And then what my hon. friend Mr. Stephen, submitted to you, was since it is an assurance the assurance could be taken care of by the Committee of Assurances. This is indeed a strange plea because here is an assurance in relation to a matter which is continuing and in relation to a privilege issue that is still under consideration. This has to be considered by the House as a whole. That will not be considered by any Committee of Assurances.

Finally, the hon. Law Minister, I hope, also said that prosecution would be launched after the investigation is completed. Had we ever suggested at any point of time that prosecution should not be launched but prosecution at what point of time. For how many times should I reiterate, prosecution after the results of the investigation are presented to the House and that does not conflict with any desire to launch the prosecution in the court. May I again repeat if the investigation is completed at 2 O' Clock would the matter be taken to the court at 2:30 O' clock. This point has never been replied to so that the prosecution had to be launched. We are in favour of the prosecution being launched but in terms of the assurances first the results of the investigation would have to be presented to the House and then the prosecution should have been launched in the court. There is no conflict between the two and it is a pure prevarication on the part of Law Minister and he has not fulfilled it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY IBOSU : Sir, I would be as brief as possible.

MR. SPEAKER : You asked for half a minute I have given you one minute.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : Sir, Mr. Gokhale, as an eminent lawyer, knows what to say or what not to say. We are not as faithful as he is. Mr. Madhu Limaye quoted his different speeches on 5th and 9th September, 1974 and also on an earlier date. But, on 3rd September, 1974, Mr. Gokhale had said:

“Perhaps, that stage may come later on after the investigation is completed and then this House can decide about this. I know the anxiety of the hon. Members.”

He said not less than three times that the Report of the C. B. I. will be made available to this House before the court of law takes any action. Now, I have got a copy of the charge-sheet. The charge-sheet is dated 9th November, 1974. They did not come forward with the charge-sheet before the House on the 11th the first working day of the House. Instead, they chose to go to the court and in due course, made it *sub-judice* more or less placing a restriction on the House to go into the matter. I say that not only he has treated this House with utmost contempt—I regret to say it but he has also taken it to the court making the whole issue as *sub-judice*.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we adjourn and we shall take it up tomorrow.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA : No, Sir. This matter has to be decided.

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed the other Ministers to speak. I cannot take a decision. Tomorrow the other Ministers who are still waiting will get their chance. I shall give them chance tomorrow.

So, we adjourn now and re-assemble after lunch at Fifteen of the Clock.

14.57 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till fifteen of the Clock.