

मानता हूँ। मेरा कहना यह है कि हमने कभी जनता की भावना का निरादर नहीं किया, लेकिन देश में कुछ लोग जो हिंसा का वातावरण बनाना चाहते हैं, हम ने उसकी निन्दा जरूर की है। गुजरात में जो हुआ, बिहार में जो हुआ और जो हिंसा की घटनाएँ हुईं, वह किन दलों के कारण हुई? . . . . . हम लोगों का कहना यह है कि देश में जो स्थिति है उस को देखते हुए संविधान की मर्यादा रख कर कोई काम होना चाहिये। हमने इस बात की आलोचना जरूर की है और कहा है कि हिंसा को बढ़ावा नहीं होना चाहिये।

जहाँ तक माननीय सदस्य श्री वाजपेयी का प्रश्न है, मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि वह आज के प्रदर्शन से बिल्कुल अलग हैं क्योंकि वह जानते थे कि इसमें हिंसा होगी। (अध्यक्षान)

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : नहीं होगी।

श्री शंकर बयाल सिंह : इस लिये हमें इस बात की खुशी है (अध्यक्षान)

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह कभी मेरे ऊपर हिंसा का आरोप लगाते हैं। आज यह कह रहे हैं कि मैं इसलिये अलग हूँ कि मैं जानता हूँ कि हिंसा भी होगी। आप कुछ तो समझदारी दिखाइये। दिल्ली में एक असाधारण स्थिति है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप पार्लियामेंट में तमाम दुनिया की बातें रोज़ लाते हैं। आज यहाँ हिंसा पर बहस थोड़े ही चल रही है। अब कुछ काम भी तो करने बीजिये।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : सारे देश में गुस्से की लहर दौड़ रही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : देश में गुस्से की लहर दौड़ रही है, यहाँ तो शान्त रहिये।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : दिल्ली में शान्तिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन के लिये गुंजाइश नहीं है। आज जो मजदूर जुलूस निकाल रहे थे उन पर हमला किया गया। आप जांच कराइये कि किसने हमला किया। (अध्यक्षान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप इसको छोड़िये, कुछ काम करने बीजिये।

12.24 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST U.N.I

MR. SPEAKER: I am passing on to the next subject, the question of privilege sought to be raised by Shri Amrit Nahata against the UNI, *Indian Express*, *Hindustan Times* and *Times of India* regarding alleged misreporting of Fortyseventh Report of Committee on Public Undertakings. This was brought some time back and I have got the report ready.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan): Where is Shri Amrit Nahata?

MR. SPEAKER: I am not concerned whether he is present or not. It is already in today's list.

On the 28th March, 1974, Shri Amrit Nahata sought to raise a question of privilege against the UNI, the *Indian Express*, the *Hindustan Times* and the *Times of India* for alleged misreporting of the Fortyseventh Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings on Modern Bakeries (India) Limited. . .

The Deputy Speaker who was then in the Chair observed that the General Manager of the UNI and the Editors of the newspapers concerned would be asked to state what they had to say in the matter.

The Editor and General Manager of the UNI in his reply dated the 2nd April, 1974, quoted certain

[Mr. Speaker]

passages from the 47th Report of Committee on Public Undertakings and stated, *inter alia*, as follows:—

“We submit that the headlines are given by individual newspapers to all the agency reports as is evident from the fact that headlines vary from newspaper to newspaper. The UNI is not, therefore, responsible for the headlines appearing in the newspapers....

A comparison of the UNI report with the PUC report would show that the opening para of the agency's report is a legitimate inference drawn from the Committee's observation, explicit in the concluding part of the passage quoted above inasmuch as the Committee deemed it necessary to recommend stricter measures to ensure that 'stale and mouldy bread' is not put on the market.

There are passages on pages 70, 71 and 72 of the Report containing unambiguous admission by a representative of Modern Bakeries examined by the Committee that defective bread was not only being put on the market but were also being sold....

We feel that these passages in the report fully justify the UNI report.

Shri Nahata has alleged that the UNI report was 'baked with the assistance of the foreign bakeries, including Britannia'. It is unfortunate that he should make this allegation which has no substance. We like to submit that the UNI report was put out on its teleprinter circuit to all its subscribers from the press room in Parliament House within an hour of the report being placed on the Table of the Lok Sabha.

We submit that there is no breach of privilege and the report

was issued in good faith as we do in the case of other reports.”

AN HON. MEMBER: Accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: There are a lot of other things. Don't be impatient. The Resident Editor of the *Indian Express* in his reply dated the 30th March, 1974, stated as follows:—

“...the news story...was circulated by the United News of India, one of the two national news agencies. We published the news story in good faith in the normal course. It is obviously not possible for a newspaper to check the accuracy of every news report supplied by a news agency.”

The Editor of the *Hindustan Times* in his reply dated the 30th March, 1974, stated as follows:—

“We published the item 'Modern Bread under Fire'...—bread is always on the fire—

“...in our issue dated March 26 in the belief that it was an accurate summary of certain of the findings of the Committee on Public Undertakings that had been field by the UNI to which we subscribe.

The item was published in good faith. However, if there were any inaccuracies in the report, we were not aware of these and deeply regret it and I would request you to kindly inform the Speaker accordingly and to assure him that any infringement of privilege in this case was wholly inadvertent.”

The *Hindustan Times* has been very clear in its regret. The Editor of the *Times of India* in his reply dated the 5th April, 1974, stated *inter alia* as follows:—

“The comment to which you refer was based on a UNI report. We

are satisfied that the report in question was in no way *mala fide*. It faithfully summarised the PUC's report. The PUC report specifically referred to 'state and mouldy bread' in para 3.43 on page 72—

It is clear from what I have said above that the comments was entirely fair and that there was no intention in any way to misrepresent or distort the contents of the PUC's report."

This is the position taken by them.

I then referred the matter to the Committee on Public Undertakings for their comments on the stand taken by UNI.

The Chairman of the Committee on Public Undertakings, in her note dated the 30th April, 1974, has conveyed to me the following opinion of the Committee on Public Undertakings:—

"The Committee in their 47th Report on Modern Bakeries (India) Ltd. observed that on examining the question of state and mouldy bread, they found that in the case of Bangalore, Bombay and Kanpur units, the percentage of return of state and mouldy bread was more than one per cent during 197273 as compared to the norm of 0.5 per cent fixed by the Management with effect from 2nd December, 1972. The Committee viewed with concern the high percentage of return of such bread in these units. The Committee recommended that effective measures should be taken by the Undertaking to tighten up its inspection machinery so that state and mouldy bread was not put in the market. The Committee had not said in their Report that stale and mouldy bread was actually being sold in the market. In the circumstances, the Committee felt that the UNI report and heading

carried by certain newspapers had not done justice to the letter and spirit of the recommendations of the Committee."

This is a very light comment by them. They have not denied what was mentioned in the report.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): They could not deny.

MR. SPEAKER: ...but they say that the headlines had not done justice to the spirit of the recommendations of the Committee.

In view of the above explanations given by all of them—the General Manager of the UNI and the Editors of the concerned newspapers—and the opinion of the Committee on Public Undertakings, I feel that, if the House agrees, the matter may be dropped.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): The matter may be dropped and Mr. Amrit Nahata may be reprimanded for having raised it.

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN (Kangra): Mr. Amrit Nahata should be complimented for having brought forward this matter.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: There should be a motion for breach of privilege against Mr. Amrit Nahata for having cast aspersions on them.

MR. SPEAKER: That is going too far. If you go hair-splitting, the question is under a very thin line. Perhaps, Mr. Amrit Nahata may gain by that.

I take it that the House agrees that the matter should be dropped.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

श्री रामाबतार शास्त्री (पटना) :  
मेरी बात को नोट कर लिया जाना चाहिये ।

[श्री रामाबल्लार शास्त्री]

मैं पब्लिक ग्रंडरटेकिंग्स कमेटी का मੈम्बर था ।  
मैं इससे सहमत नहीं हूँ ।

I am not convinced. I do not support this. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: I tell you, my skin cannot get thicker than this. It has reached the limit. Keep this as a Parliament. It is not meant for shouting like this.

हर वक्त बोलते रहना ऊंची आवाज में ठीक नहीं है । कभी तो आराम से बैठ करे । उधर वे खड़े हो जाते हैं और उधर आप हो जाते हैं ।

12.33 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE  
ANNUAL PLAN, 1974-75

THE MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRI D. P. DHAR): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the "Annual Plan, 1974-75" (Hindi and English versions).

GUJARAT SALES TAX (AMDT.) RULES, 1974 AND A STATEMENT

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. R. GANESH): I beg to lay on the Table:—

(1) A copy of the Gujarat Sales Tax (Amendment) Rules, 1974, published in Notification No. (GHN 230) GSR 1074/(11)-TH in Gujarat Government Gazette dated the 2nd April, 1974, under sub-section (5) of section 86 of the Gujarat Sales Tax Act, 1969, read with clause (c) (iii) of the Proclamation dated the 9th February, 1974, issued by the President in relation to the State of Gujarat.

(2) A statement (Hindi and English versions) explaining the reasons for not laying simultaneously the Hindi version of the Notifica-

tion [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-6895/74*].

ANNUAL REPORT AND CERTIFIED ACCOUNTS TOGETHER WITH AUDIT REPORT OF INTERNATIONAL AIRPORTS AUTHORITY OF INDIA FOR 1972-73 AND AIRCRAFT (2ND AMDT.) RULES, 1974

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI): I beg to lay on the Table:—

(1) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the International Airports Authority of India for the year 1972-73, under sub-section (2) of section 25 of the International Airports Authority Act, 1971. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-6896/74*].

(2) A copy of the Certified Accounts (Hindi and English versions) of the International Airports Authority of India for the period 1st February, 1972 to 31st March, 1973 together with the Audit Report thereon, under sub-section (4) of section 24 of the International Airports Authority Act, 1971. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-6897/74*].

(3) A copy of the Aircraft (Second Amendment) Rules, 1974 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No. G.S.R. 395 in Gazette of India dated the 13th April, 1974, under section 14A of the Aircraft Act, 1934, together with an explanatory note. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-6898/74*].

GUJARAT PRIVATE FORESTS (ACQUISITION) RULES, 1974

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI B. P. MAURYA): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Gujarat Private Forests (Acquisition)