

(c) No reference has so far been received from the company in regard to the continuance of the Executive Chairman of the company beyond 31st March, 1975

(d) Does not arise

**CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO USQ
NO 257 DATED 12/11/1974 RE
CRUDE OIL SUPPLIED TO HPCL
UNDER THE AGREEMENT WITH
ESSO**

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (SHRI K D MALAVIYA) In the reply given by the Minister of State Ministry of Petroleum and Chemicals in the Lok Sabha on 12th November 1974 to Part 'b' of Unstarred Question No 257 regarding crude oil supplied to HPCL under agreement with Esso the top price per barrel for the Arabian Mix Crude comprising 80 per cent Arabian Light and 20 per cent Arabian Heavy as on October 3 1974 has been indicated as \$ 11 094 This figure may be corrected to read as \$ 10 094

2 This mistake occurred due to typographical error It was detected while answering a similar Question in the Rajya Sabha on the 25th November 1974 The mistake and the delay in correcting it is regretted

12 15 hrs

Re IMPORT LICENCE CASE

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (ग्वालियर)
अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल प्राप के कज में विरोधी दलों के नेताओं की एक बैठक लाइसेंस बीटाले के सम्बन्ध में सी० बी० घाई० की रिपोर्ट, और उस से सम्बन्धित सभी कागजात, देखने के लिए हुई थी। यह बैठक प्रधान मंत्री के 9 दिसम्बर के सुझाव के अनुसार आयोजित की नहीं थी। मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ कि उस दिन प्रधान मंत्री जी ने क्या कहा

'But in view of the entirely unjustified propaganda being carried or inside the House and outside, and to accommodate the sentiments of the Opposition while maintaining legal rectitude Government is willing to accept your suggestion that the Leaders of the Opposition might see in confidence and under oath of secrecy the CBI report, statements made by witnesses and documents seized during the investigation, the report of the handwriting expert and even the case diaries which are not even shown to the accused Our hesitation to do so was merely to prevent situations in the future which would inhibit people from giving information'

इस के बाद मंत्री विरोधी दलों की ओर से श्री मोगरजी देसाई ने डिप्युटी स्पीकर की अपील पर प्रधान मंत्री के सुझाव को मान लिया। सुझाव स्वीकार करते हुए श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने जो कुछ कहा, मैं उसे भी उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ

"I would say that I accept the offer made by the Prime Minister for placing of relevant papers before the leaders along with you without prejudice to our right which flows from Parliament for any further probe or action which may arise after a perusal of these papers consistently with observing necessary secrecy

अध्यक्ष महोदय, कल की बैठक से पहले विरोधी दलों के नेताओं ने प्राप के सामने यह सुझाव रखा था कि हमें सी० बी० घाई० की रिपोर्ट और तत्सम्बन्धी दस्तावेजों के बारे में कुछ नोट लेने की इजाजत होनी चाहिए। कहा जाता है कि यह रिपोर्ट 1200 पेज की है, उस में तथ्य हैं, तारीखें हैं, जानकारी है, क्यायन है, सी० बी० घाई० दिन तारीखों पर पढ़नी है उन तारीखों का

सब्रह्म है । ये स रो श्रीजी हम केवल स्वान्त-
गुणाय नहीं देखना चाहते हैं—उन को
केवल देखने के लिए नहीं देखना चाहते हैं ।

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पांडे (मोरखपुर) :
किस लिए देखना चाहते हैं ?

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी . लाइसेंस
स्कैंडल कोई सरकार द्वारा बनाया गया नया
ताज महल नहीं है, जिस को देख कर हम
मतोष का अनुभव कर ले । हम व कागजात
इस लिए देखना चाहते हैं कि अगर उन्हें
देखने के बाद हम जरूरत समझे तो हम यह
माग कर सके कि इस में श्रीर जाच की
आवश्यकता है और कुछ व्यक्तियों के विरुद्ध
कार्यवाही की आवश्यकता है । इसी लिए
नोट लेने की आवश्यकता है ।

भाज के अखबारों में यह खबर छपी है
आप ने हमें नोट नहीं लेने दिये ।

श्री मधु लामये (बाका) यह टाइम्स
भाफ इंडिया है ।

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी : मैं इस का
खंडन करना चाहता हूँ । कल की बैठक
में मैं उपस्थित था । जहा तक मेरी धारणा
है, कल मैंने जो कुछ अपना दिमाग बनाया,
उस से तो मुझे लगा कि आप चाहते हैं कि इस
सामले में प्रतिपक्ष को जहा तक एकामोडेट
किया जा सके, किया जाना चाहिए । लेकिन
अगर कोई बाधक थे, तो पार्लियामेंटरी
एफेयर्स के मिनिस्टर, श्री रघुनाथैया । वह
बार बार यह कह रहे थे कि मुझे इन्द्रकान नहीं
है कि आप नोट ले सके ।

श्री नारायण लाल : किस की इस्ट्र-
क्वेंस न ?

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी . अब यह तो
स्पष्ट है कि किस की इन्द्रकान की वह चर्चा
कर रहे थे ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय आप अदर की बात
यहा मत करिए ।

श्री अटल बिहारी बाजपेयी लेकिन
मैं अपने दिल की बात तो कर सकता हूँ ।
दिल श्री मेरा अन्दर ही है ।

सवाल यह है कि क्या सरकार हम को
इस स्थिति में डालना चाहती है कि हम थोड़ी
देर क गजात देखे और फिर बाहर चले जायें,
अपनी याददाश्त से उन के नोट बनाए,
फिर लौट कर आए और फिर कागजात
देखें ? अगर मंत्री महोदय की यह भशा है
तो हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है । हम यह
कसरत करने के लिए तैयार है । लेकिन यह
हास्यास्पद होगा । हम ने एक बचन दिया है
कि जो हम जानकारी प्राप्त करेंगे उसे बाहर
नहीं जाने देंगे तो उसे गुप्त रखना हमारा
नैतिक दायित्व है । (व्यवधान)

मेरा निवेदन यह है कि पार्लियामेन्टी
अफेयर्स के मिनिस्टर इस सदन के खिलाफ
उस सदन को और उस सदन के खिलाफ
इस सदन को छोडा करने को कोशिश न
करे । हमें यह कहा जा रहा है कि दूसरे
सदन के आप की पार्टी के मन्त्रियों ने रेकार्ड
देखना माल लिया जब कि हम ने उन से पूछा
तो उन्होंने यह बताया कि उन से यह कहा
गया कि लोक सभा के आप की पार्टी के मन्त्रियों
ने रिपोर्ट देखना माल लिया ।
(व्यवधान) . . . हम जल्दी जल्दी रिपोर्ट
और दस्तावेज देखना चाहते है ।

मैं आप के यह निवेदन करना चाहता
हूँ कि एक तो आप अपनी स्थिति स्पष्ट
कर दीजिए कि आप नोट्स लेने के विरुद्ध

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

नहीं है। आप ने मना नहीं किया न मना करने के हक में है। जो खबर छपी है वह गलत छपी है और पार्लियामेन्ट्री प्रोफेसर्स के मिनिस्टर से कहिए कि वह स्केच विचार कर के बताएं। उन्होंने सोच लिया या नहीं? उन्हें ऊपर से निर्देश मिला या नहीं और फिर उस के बाद हम अपना रवैया तय करना चाहते हैं।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour). Sir, I want to make a submission..

SOME HON. MEMBERS rose—

अध्यक्ष महोदय उन्होंने मन्त्री की तरफ से कह दिया। अब अलग अलग क्या कहना चाहते हैं ?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, last week when the Opposition leaders met under your Chairmanship, the united offer was that we should be able to make our own notes. After that, about four days have passed. Mr. Vajpayee has quoted the Prime Minister's speech dated 9th December. Eight days have already passed from that. Now we are coming closer to the end of the Session which is perhaps the last Session of this Lok Sabha. . .

MR. SPEAKER. Do not have any such apprehension.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU. We have not been able to get a clarification.

Yesterday a meeting took place and the whole thing was reiterated. But today in the morning paper we see something which must have been planted by the Government. Mr. Raghu Ramaiah is a double-edged sword: with one he cuts this side and with the other he cuts the other side. A story has been planted to divert the suspicion on your goodness and I want this to be clarified.

MR. SPEAKER: This is something which I could contradict. Do not take it as planting. I do not suspect anybody.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: This is a story, Sir, which has been planted by the Government in the press in order to divert the attention of the people from the person, the Prime Minister, who is really responsible for standing in the way, they are passing the suspicion on to you because you do not choose to contradict this.

In this context, please tell me, Sir, when the document is made available, how on earth one can do justice to the job unless he is able to make notes when he finds necessary. They are standing in the way. I would request you to apply your mind to this and not lose sight of the attitude of the Opposition who have been very reasonable in this regard. Let that not be misused or exploited by the Prime Minister for furthering her own ends and for shielding the corrupt Ministers.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI (Shajapur). I was present in the Opposition Leaders' meeting. As far as I remember, it was accepted that we could not take verbatim reports, but that from our memory we could take down the gist of it. In that case, I was really surprised to see the headlines in the Times of India that we were not allowed. Therefore, I support Shri Vajpayee that you must come out with a clarification that it was not your intention. (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Chattrapur): It has also appeared in the Motherland. . (Interruptions)

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai). The basic thing for you to consider is whether we are outsiders or strangers or we are a part of the government. The Government consists of all the three wings—the legislature, the executive and the judiciary. And could you allow the hon. Members of Parliament to be treated in the man-

would you allow the hon. Members of Parliament to be treated in the manner in which the Government is treating us? If we are allowed to see the documents, it is for the purpose of coming to certain conclusions and for ascertaining the truth in the matter. Now, if you think that after perusing documents running into 1200 pages or so, we are not to take down notes—really we do not want to come at this juncture to any conclusions—how are we to come to any conclusions and ascertain the truth? We will have to look into the whole thing and after having gone through the entire set of documents and we will come to certain conclusions? Therefore, I think that it would be all a futile and fruitless game to peruse the documents without taking down notes. And then it has been rightly said that if we go out only after... (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: It is all a repetition.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Who is repeating?... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): If they have to take down notes, why don't you better give copies to them?

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: A very good suggestion. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Is there any sense in it?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: If we give you words that we would not divulge anything, then we want to be as true as our words. But if you ask us not to take down notes, you would not be able to prevent us from going outside and taking down the notes. Then, that would become a prolonged affair. And, may I also tell you that this has been the impression of everybody who attended the meeting during the last week, that there was an agreement that there would be no ban on taking down the notes. Now it seems to be an after-thought of the 2969 LS—8.

Government that it wants to prevent us from taking down the notes.... (*Interruptions*)

We are only bound by the offer, the terms of offer by the hon'ble Prime Minister and the terms of acceptance by the hon'ble Member Shri Morarji Desai. We cannot allow any other term to be included in them. And then, you happen to be the Chairman of the Committee. Therefore, it should also be your duty to assist us in ascertaining the truth in this matter. Which can be done only when we have made a thorough study of it after taking down the notes and so on.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: I am on a limited question. Today's *Motherland* has published a news item with banner headlines saying, 'Opposition leaders walk out as Speaker disallows jottings'. Sir, I doubt the authenticity of this news item. The Speaker would not have said anything. If at all objection is to be raised it would have come from the Government. So, what I submit is, the leaders who had attended the meeting in your chamber had committed a breach of privilege and an act of impropriety for which you have to admonish them. I am not pressing for breach of privilege but I want you to admonish them for this act of impropriety.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Jainagar): It is unfortunate something has leaked out to the press and by whomsoever it has been done, it is a sort of breach of gentleman's agreement or understanding. It is supposed that whatever happens there will be kept secret. The news that the Speaker disallowed jottings and the news that the opposition leaders walked out, both are incorrect.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): For once you are right

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: I hope you will maintain this commonsense always!

MR. SPEAKER: I will not mind even if 10 per cent is correct. It is all a guesswork. If you see the news item they are not identical even. Some papers say something something else is said by some other papers.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: So, I say this is factually incorrect. They did not walk out. Time was given to Government to consider the issue. The question is one of differentiation between quotation and taking notes, whether they can differentiate that or not. There is one other point. I do not want to repeat what has been said by other hon. Members. The other day the offer was made by Prime Minister and we in this House could not persuade ourselves to accept that offer on that day but it was accepted in the Rajya Sabha.

The next day, it was accepted by us here too. And Mr. Morarji Desai made a statement and we accepted it. It was pointed out that if we accepted that the next day why we did not accept it on that very day.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: How is it relevant?

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: It is very pertinent. I want to make a submission and so I would like the Members to hear me. I want to tell you one thing. I want the House and the country to know whether the CBI Chargesheet is a real one or only a summary that is filed in the court. That is why we demanded that the whole report should be gone into in order to ascertain the facts. The whole country is waiting in expectation that the leaders of the Opposition will go into the entire report and, if they are satisfied that there is truth in the chargesheet, the matter rests there. If they are not satisfied with the contents or if they find that

something is suppressed or has not been quoted in the prosecution stage or in the chargesheet, then we have a right to go into the whole question. In Rajya Sabha I have talked to some of the Members where almost all party members were present.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Our party was not there.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: At the meeting of yesterday in Rajya Sabha a method was adopted. Whoever may be the Member who was present they perused the report and put a flag to that page. Afterwards it would be easy for them if they want to reconstruct the whole matter. That was done by marking and flagging.

The Opposition may take notes naturally. But, we are supposed to maintain some secrecy. It would be much better at least what happened in the Rajya Sabha is done in Lok Sabha too.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: No.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA: Please hear me. The whole country expects us to go through the whole report. Otherwise the people will think that we are not doing our duty. We have to go through the report and satisfy ourselves one way or the other so that the country knows where the matter stands and whether the person concerned has been shielded or not. Let us follow the method adopted by the Rajya Sabha. Shri Morarji Desai gave his statement the next day. This method can be adopted. Whatever may be the page, if you think that there is something, we may flag it and may make use of the portions. That is my submission. (Interruptions). Please allow me to complete my submission. Do not disturb me.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Why did you mention the name of Shri Morarji Desai?

SHRI BHOGENDR A JHA: Please do not disturb me. Simply I want to state that we are duty bound and the whole country is waiting that the leaders of the Opposition will go through the report to see if there is anything new in the report; after the Prime Minister's statement, Shri Morarji Desai made his statement. If the Government accepts the method that is welcome. We can follow the method of Rajya Sabha. We have to peruse the report to find out the truth. We are also accountable to the country. Somehow we have to find out the truth.

I am not talking on this side or that side. The whole House is committed. This was the unanimous understanding of the House that the leaders of the Opposition will peruse the report. On no, pretext, on no account, we should give the impression that we have no courage to go through the report and peruse the report. I would again make a request. I think those who have the courage to find out the truth should go through the report and have flaggings, as was done in the Rajya Sabha. This will be the way out. You can think over it.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Sir, I am sure, the Opposition does not want to precipitate a crisis again. I hope they do not. I am now speaking on the basis of what has appeared in the Press today. Today, Sir, there is a news in more than one paper that the Opposition walked out on your disallowing them to take notes. This is the crux. This is Motherland, not my paper. This is Motherland of which Mr. Vajpayee has a control. Prati Pakksh also could be quoted. 'Opposition leaders walk out as speaker disallows jotting'. That is what has been said. Therefore, the fact remains. Now, Sir, we thought that once the Opposition showed the grace of accepting everything in confidence, once they showed the grace, may be as an after thought, they will see the documents to satisfy themselves—this has been the crux, as you also pointed out—as to whether

there was something against some one else who was not involved in the criminal case. That is what they wanted to know. Therefore, if this was the only object, we cannot do anything more than having a perusal, because Sir, taking down notes tantamounts to having more or less a copy which was specifically refused. Therefore,

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): Why was it specifically refused?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: We know now. Let us not go back into the whole thing because no prejudice was wanted to be cast on the criminal trial.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Prejudice is not your concern.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: We have discussed it. Let us not go back into the whole thing. The House does not agree with Mr. Piloo Mody. Nobody in the country agrees with Mr. Piloo Mody. Of course, he does not care for the country. He belongs to somewhere else. They are trying to queer the pitch, playing foul. You know that the ball is in your court and you are on a weak wicket. Then, you try to find some other excuses, you find fault with the umpires, you find fault with somebody else's decision and then trying to quit.

SHRI PILOO MODY: It is like cricket.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: This is not cricket. If you want to play cricket, play it with courage, play it with grace, play it bravely and come and see the entire documents in the same manner as the elders, gentlemen of the Rajya Sabha, are doing.

We can agree that 1200 pages cannot be remembered. Therefore, it was agreed that you may have markings, so that you may ultimately bring it to the notice first of the Speaker, that here is some material which we want

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

ultimately to bring to the notice of the Leader for further action. Have markings but do not take down notes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Why?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: No nothing can be allowed because that will defeat the very purpose of confidentiality and secrecy.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): In your ruling, you very rightly remarked that it was an impropriety on the part of Government not to have placed the report on the Table of the Sabha. Then the Prime Minister *suo motu* came a proposal that she is prepared to show the report provided we keep it secret under an oath of secrecy. We accepted it and wanted to see the report. The question of objecting to taking down notes is an afterthought, it is a later invention. It is nobody else but Shri Raghu Ramajah who is trying to put all impediments in showing the report to us. It is his invention that no notes will be taken down

You know that we are all hon members. We are not going to divulge any secret, but for our own benefit, we would like to take down notes, so that we can remember the points in what has been written in the 1200 pages. It is not possible to memorise all these 1200 pages. It is a very genuine demand; and if at all this objection was an afterthought and you should not take any notice of it. We should have full freedom to take down notes! I suggest that if you want, those notes be kept in your chamber. We are prepared to keep those notes there when we leave the Committee meeting.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contd): It will be wrong if an impression is created in the country that the hon Speaker stood in the way of a meaningful perusal of the CBI report by Opposition spokesman. I do not want any grace or any favour from the Treasury benches. But I want to re-collect and remind you of what exactly

happened in the first day's meeting. The decisions that were taken on the first day should be followed. I remember you were very helpful. There were two basic controversies. One was whether only the leaders of the groups or parties would be there or whether anybody who may be chosen by the different parties would be accepted. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs was strongly opposed to the latter saying that only the leaders of the different parties would be allowed to see them.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Then Shrimati Indira Gandhi should have been there from the opposite side, not Shri Raghu Ramaiah.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: You resolved the problem by your helpful suggestion that any representative of the parties could be present there and he would continue to be present and only he would attend the meetings. That was the number one problem solved by you.

MR SPEAKER: What is the use of secrecy if all that happened at the meeting is to be given out?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The second issue was whether noting of the CBI report would be permitted. There also you resolved the problem. I quote *verbatim* what you said: Notes may be taken, but that is a *verbatim* quotation will not be accepted on the floor of the House if it is used on the floor of the House.

MR SPEAKER: Please do not say that. Various suggestions were made to the Minister.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: This was accepted

After accepting this at your suggestion, in the first meeting, how can the hon. Minister back out from that? Is it the artistic pleasure, how beautifully typed report is the CBI report or the literary pleasure, how beautiful the

police have framed sentences in the CBI report. Is it that kind of pleasure that we want to derive? It will be our duty. Those who will be the spokesmen of the different parties will after the perusal of the report, if they find anything in the report which affects the dignity and honour and privilege of Parliament, that will be brought before the House? If any action is necessary, it should be followed. That was the whole objective of the perusal of the CBI report. What has been accepted under your presidentship and guidance and according to our suggestion should be fully implemented by the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): I am grateful to the hon. Members who have paid me such copious compliments. One of them said that I am playing one against the other; another said that I planted this in the Press to embarrass everybody. I wish I were such a Machiavelli. They all know that I am a nice gentleman and that is why they take advantage of it. However, I may say this. Whatever they throw at me, I take it as a bouquet of roses; they know that also. Therefore, I do not mind. Let me make it clear that whatever I said then and whatever I say now and whatever I say tomorrow will be on behalf of the Government; nothing personal so far as I am concerned. (*Interruptions*)

I am glad Shri Vajpayee has quoted the Prime Minister she said that she was willing to accept the suggestion that the Leaders of the Opposition "might see in confidence and under oath of secrecy". Shri Vajpayee has said; we do not want to see for ourselves. Then whom do you want to see for?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I did not say that; he does not follow Hindi and he makes a mess of it.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: I shall clear that mess.

MR. SPEAKER: Sometimes you see certain people; sometimes you are tempted to kiss them; they feel tempted to see and kiss the report sometimes.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: The spirit of the offer of the Prime Minister is what? In the previous sentence the Prime Minister says: "Entirely unjustified propaganda was carried on inside and outside". What was the propaganda? What something was being hidden and therefore it is not being shown. The idea of showing it to the Leaders of the Opposition was to dispel that impression so that they may be able to see for themselves that the Government had nothing to hide; there is nothing more and nothing less; that was the intention.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bose said that there was a united offer four days back. Some other Member said impliedly that I agreed for the notes being taken.

The hon. Speaker knows very well that it was only a suggestion and I was asked to get Government's reaction. Government have considered the matter and they consider that seeing does not include taking notes. What do they want to take notes for, such great leaders, great orators, paragons who can retain a compendium of even 400 pages in their memory and could come and discuss any matter have without any notes? Why do they want to take notes? It is unnecessary. We don't think it is part of the offer. Therefore, there was no question of my having accepted it any stage.

Mr. Limaye pointedly said that I must have given it to some newspaper. Of late Mr. Limaye has been very much in love with me and if it is the second compliment he has paid me within one week. I do not want to throw back mud. But I remember the adage, "Thief shouts 'thief'". (*Interruptions*).

[Shri K. Raghu Rumaiah]

Shri Bhogendra Jha has made a very helpful suggestion. He said, let us follow the Rajya Sabha procedure. On behalf of the Government, I accept it whole-heartedly.

Shri P. K. Deo has given me a lot of compliments by saying that Mr. Raghu Ramaiah is putting all impediments. I wish I could I am not putting any impediment. From the very beginning, I am here to seek your cooperation to see that the work of this House goes on smoothly, consistently with the dignity and prestige of the House. I have devoted my entire career as Parliamentary Affairs Minister to that objective. I will cooperate with you. Please cooperate with me. Don't make a confrontation.

SHRI SMAR GUHA: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order. It is not going to be a debate. I am not calling anybody. Unless all of you sit down, I will not proceed. I have not called any person.

It is unfortunate that this matter has been brought to the House

13 00 hrs

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (इलाहाबाद) : केवल एक वलरिक्शन मती महोदय से करना चाहता

MR. SPEAKER: I am not going to make any observation. The Speaker is standing and you deliberately defy him

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : मैं प्राप को डिफाई नहीं कर रहा हूँ। मैं तो उन से एक वलरिक्शन चाहता हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER: I gave a chance to all the leaders of the parties. It is not essential for me that I should accommodate the members also.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : लीडर का क्या जवाब है? कांग्रेस पार्टी से साठे साहब को प्राप ने कैसे प्रलाठ किया? वे कांग्रेस पार्टी के लीडर हैं क्या?

MR. SPEAKER: Somebody must speak on their behalf also. There are the leaders on this side. Now, let me compose myself for a minute.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Can I give you a pill?

MR. SPEAKER: I tell you, dear Piloo, this smart and beautiful suit has completely concealed your bulk.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I have been advised to get up and bow to you.

MR. SPEAKER: It is really very unfortunate that what transpired inside the Committee should have come out in the press though in a wrong way and due to that the reactions should have come in this House. Instead of raising the controversy here, I would request both the sides to reconsider their stand—I say both the sides. After all, formulas are found, solutions are found, just by listening and discussing together. Therefore, both the sides have to reconsider. That was the reason—because I could foresee such situations, that is why in the very beginning, I was very hesitant to accept the chairmanship of this Committee. But I thought that if there was a new man, he would perhaps be lured. I considered what would be my functions. To sit and see you all reading the files throughout the day as they do in the High Court when the litigants come and see the files and the Assistant of the court just keeps watching. I wanted to be sure about my functions, where I stand, what will be my functions, what types of objections and difficulties will I have to handle. What problems will arise. Now they have started arising before the work has started. Anyway, that

should not have been referred to. But the reports appeared in such a manner that there was no alternative, the matter found its way in the House. You are very ingenious people, you do find something for debate every day. When I get up in the morning, I pray that God will be kind to me today at least, and I am greatly disillusioned when I enter the House. Sometimes even before the Question Hour such things start and go on for the whole day. I very much beseech you, we leave it here.

As for the other matter, entirely different from the reports in the Press....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Make your position clear that you did not come in the way.

MR. SPEAKER: Since you have also divulged what was going on inside and the Minister has also divulged that what prohibits me from divulging it, I tell you, whatever has appeared in the press is not correct. There was no walk-out, not did I give any ruling that this should be the condition or that should happen.

As for the Press, I am an old journalists and I had my days and I do not know, but if you are kind enough to me, then, I may not have to go back to my old profession as a lawyer or a journalist....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Which one would you like?

MR. SPEAKER: Where you may never come across me in my life time.
.... (Interruptions)

My attitude towards the Press in view of this background and which I had also mentioned in my speech at Shillong is this:

"... I would say this particularly in our attitude to and relationship with the Press. While, as I said

earlier, all participants in the democratic process ought to live up to their responsibilities, it should not be forgotten that the Press is an important constituent and partner in the democratic adventure and should therefore be enabled to function free without inhibition. I for one would think...."

That is my advice to all the Speakers of the country:

"...that we must take a total view of a situation when it comes to the question of our privileges vis-a-vis the Press, Parliament and the legislatures in India would be doing entirely the right thing by themselves in taking as far as possible a generous view of lapses here and there (which often, when you go into it, may not be intentional)...."

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Let us then free the Press Council.

MR. SPEAKER: "...in the interests of the free functioning of an important ally in the democratic cause."

This was my observation and advice to the Presiding Officers while dealing with the privileges against the Press.

Now, unfortunately, I was the first victim of the Press, and that too, at Shillong, though I am indeed very grateful to the Leaders of the Opposition that they had accepted my explanation. Unfortunately, I was never aware till you wrote to me because when I returned and reached home, I immediately contradicted it and explained it. After a few days I received the full text of my Rotary Club speech at Shillong my entry, the welcome speech, the introduction speech, my own speech and all that followed, I thought that I should bring it to your notice and I requested you to kindly hear it on the tape and in

[Mr. Speaker]

spite of that, you said, 'No, no. We believe it'

Whatever my views are on democracy, we sometimes note in the Press omissions, sometimes under-statements, sometimes under-ment-ionings of the proceedings, sometimes over-statements and exaggerations. We do not mind if we are omitted. But, when there is a mis-reporting, we feel concerned. When there is a distortion, we are still more concerned. When there is a concoction, we feel helpless.

I was very happy that in case of my Shillong speech, the head of the Press Trust of India, Shri Ramachandran, came on the way from Bombay and he expressed his regrets. But I asked him to let me know how it happened. I asked the Secretary-General to contact the PTI representative in Delhi. To my great surprise, when he came, the Secretary-General informed me that he was most casual—a person whom I knew and from whom I expected a good response. So, I applied the formula which I have given here

At least then I was not here and I was in Shillong. The day I arrived, all types of articles and editorials appeared and I was the worst victim. Now, this is the second time. After all, you are dealing with the Speaker. He holds some position in the country. There is no harm if you just contact him and either tell him about the exact position—what is not to be disclosed or what they can mention. It was my surprise this morning when I found this news-item which, as you know, was totally wrong. And, I tell you, if you had not been there, it would have been very difficult for me to explain *suo moto*.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Pull him up.

MR. SPEAKER: I pull up nobody. I wish to point out that in case of the Leaders Committee also the same

Direction goes, that is, Direction No. 55. It says:

'The provision of Clause 1 shall also *mutatis mutandis* apply to the proceedings of the meeting held by the Speaker with the leaders of parties and groups in Lok Sabha.'

Now, whatever we talk, if there is any guess work which goes out, to-day it may be about Speaker of the House, tomorrow it may be in the case of another leader, and the next day it may be about some Members also. And naturally it will create a very awkward situation indeed.

श्री पिलू लिख्ये : वही बात है—जैसे क्याम बाबू और मेरे बारे में कहा गया है कि हम झगड़ा करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन आप जानते हैं कि हमारा कितना सौम्य एटी-चूड है।

MR. SPEAKER: So I would request the Members that they observe these rules in regard to whatever we do inside the leaders meeting also. After all we are bound by certain rules. It has never gone out from committees, from the mouth of the Members—either from the PAC or Estimates or in respect of many other committees of the House.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Take him to task ...

MR. SPEAKER: You are more concerned with taking him to task than listening to me!

I would request the Members of the Press, the correspondents that kindly let them have mercy on the Speaker at least—to a man who belonged to your profession at one time many years back, and also be careful that when you report, there should be some sort of near-about checking.

So, I end this note with my request to both of your and also to the Press that in dealing with this matter they should be helpful to me. And, at least, if they are not helpful to me, they should not misquote us.

And, about the other matters, as I have said, we will kindly sit together again, try to hammer out what we can do in the matter.

My job is a difficult one. I am sorry I cannot say much more than this now. Thank you very much.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We thank you, Sir.

SHRI V. TULSIRAM (Poddapalli): Sir, I have got a Privilege Motion. It should be allowed to be moved.

MR. SPEAKER: No please. I cannot take up that one as this one is already pending. There will be notice and they will be taken up later. There will be no lunch honour. There is lot of work pending. If you agree,—it is already nearing 1-30,—we can postpone it till tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

13.10 hrs.

RE. ATROCITIES ON BORO TRIBALS IN ASSAM

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, the fundamental right to profess political ideologies and expressions is totally non-existent in West Bengal. Mr. Tridib Chaudhury addressed a meeting in Dum-Dum and his meeting was disturbed by congress goondas. In this situation how do you feel that we can have protection under the Fundamental Right of exercising our own political ideologies and their implementation.

2969 LS—9.

The point is that boro tribals in Assam had been beaten up and the atrocities were committed on them. This is the Centre's responsibility. With your permission, Sir, I want you to convey to the Minister to make a statement with regard to Boro tribals in Goalpara District who were beaten up by the policemen. They are tribal people. And therefore, it is the responsibility of the Centre to see that no atrocity is committed on them.

I shall be grateful to you if you will kindly request the Home Minister to make a statement as to what he is doing to protect the rights of the tribals.

As regards the breaking-up of the meeting addressed by Shri Tridib Chaudhury, this is causing a serious concern to us and I would be grateful if you will make a suitable observation in this regard.

13.21 hrs.

RE. MURDER OF A SOCIAL WORKER AT BOLANGIR IN ORISSA

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): Sir, I wrote to you to make a submission under Rule 377.

MR. SPEAKER: If it is connected with privilege, we are taking it up the next day.

SHRI P. K. DEO: I only want to submit that this is a cold, calculated, brutal and ghastly political murder of a journalist, social worker, youth leader and a member of the District Committee of B.L.D., Shri Parsuram Satpathi at Bolangir on 29th November, 1974.

Though it is on question of law and order, it is a break-down of the Constitution in the State of Orissa. He met the Governor on the 26th.