

of the order paper be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of the following demands entered in the second column thereof:—

Demands Nos. 53, 63, 113, 129, 131 and 136."

The motion was adopted.

[The Motions for Supplementary Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha, are reproduced below—Ed]

Demand No. 53—Industries

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,16,79,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of 'Industries'."

DEMAND NO. 63—DEPARTMENT OF
REHABILITATION

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of 'Department of Rehabilitation'."

DEMAND NO. 113—LOANS AND ADVANCES BY THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 2,18,00,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of 'Loans and Advances by the Central Government'."

DEMAND NO. 129—OTHER CAPITAL
OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND
MINES

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 48,51,93,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Steel and Mines'."

DEMAND NO. 131—OTHER CAPITAL
OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF TOURISM
AND CIVIL AVIATION

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 6,89,00,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation'."

DEMAND NO. 136—CAPITAL OUTLAY
ON POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS (NOT MET
FROM REVENUE)

"That a Supplementary sum not exceeding Rs. 1,000 be granted to the President to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March, 1973, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Posts and Telegraphs (not met from Revenue)'."

15.01

APPROPRIATION (NO. 5) BILL*,
1972

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K.
R. GANESH): Sir, I beg to move for
leave to introduce a Bill to authorise
payment and appropriation of certain
further sums from and out of the
Consolidated Fund of India for the
service of the financial year 1972-73.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1972-73."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI K. R. GANESH: I introduce the Bill.

I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1972-73, be taken into consideration."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are two Members who have given their names to speak on this. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to the rule. No. 1 is, only those points which have not been covered in the course of the speeches and which relate only to the demands in question should be mentioned. This is of course a very broad provision and it is difficult to pinpoint where you are in line and where you are not.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): I do hope that these are all religiously followed for all time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I may also mention now that Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu has written to the Speaker, and has given notice of and has also sent to the Speaker a copy of a paper which he wants to lay on the Table of the House in the course of his speech. There are two papers that he has sent—

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No, Sir: the one which is—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please. Before me there are two papers.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It may be that you have been given the wrong papers.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You may help me, but let me first help myself. He has sent two papers, one of which the Speaker has seen and to which he has given the permission. Under the rules and directions, a paper has to be seen by the Speaker and he has to consider and give his permission before it is laid. The other paper which is before me, the Speaker has not seen.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): You can get his permission.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I cannot do that. (*Interruptions*).

I would tell you that you can lay the first paper which the Speaker has seen.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to make a statement.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The second paper, I cannot allow you, because the Speaker has not seen and considered it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, there are two things. I am raising a point of order. (*Interruptions*) You may ask me to go away from the House if you feel that we are weighing too much from the Opposition.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Not that, you are here to play your full part.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am indeed gratified to hear that. Now, I have given two notices. If you would be so kind as to read the notice, you will find that one requires the Speaker's permission under direction 115 to make a personal statement. I have pointed out certain discrepancies in the reply given by Shri L. N. Mishra in regard to the export figures where there are differences with the Reserve Bank of India figures for the last few years. The Speaker suggested that I

might give the figures then and there, and if I had the time I would have been glad to do it for the House. That is the one direction. I will be laying the document which will give the correct position not what the Minister had given.

The second one is about how the Government is making use of public money for furthering party interests. The Prime Minister's tour expenses used to be debited to the political party account till 1969 they are debited to the Government, to the Ministry.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR) I object to it. He should not be allowed to mention any subject without proper notice. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Unless there are skeletons in the cupboard there is no reason why they should be alarmed. I have given the required notice and enclosure in the morning. I do not know whether the Speaker has seen or has not seen. The only thing the statement that I am required to give. I have given to the Lok Sabha Secretariat notice and enclosure. My duty is finished as far as the two rules are concerned. I shall be fully credited to do this, unless you want to curtail my legitimate right because I belong to the Opposition because it embarrasses the Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*)**

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR It should be expunged.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU I am on a point of order.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER I shall listen to the point of order. (*Interruptions*). The order is that when the Chair is on its legs, Members must sit down. I shall listen to you again. Now again I refer you to the rules. No allegation of a defamatory or in-

criminatory nature could be made without notice first being given to the Speaker and to the Minister concerned. I think the statement you made just now.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Without mentioning the name.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER You mentioned the office.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU What is the coverage for office? Where is it?

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Whoever is the Prime Minister that is the allegation made without proper notice and therefore it is expunged.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR We take serious objection even to his interpretation of the directions, he cannot say so without a copy being passed on to the Minister concerned. It is a misuse of the privilege.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU On a point of order.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER I shall listen to you. Since both your papers are before me and since you would speak on this, I thought I should mention this, which I have done. I have told you that to the first paper the Speaker has given permission. I am now concerned with the rules. The second paper, the Speaker has not seen, and therefore the question of permission does not arise. No paper can be laid on the Table of the House unless the Speaker has okayed it, the rules are very clear. Therefore, I was telling Mr. Bosu to advance, since the has already given notice that in the course of his speech, if he wants to lay the first paper, I shall allow.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I do not want to lay....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If he wants to lay the second paper, I cannot allow because that has not been seen by the Speaker.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Sir, on a point of order. The hon. Member is expected to submit to the Speaker a document before laying it on the Table of the House. So far as he is concerned, he has conformed to the rules that have been laid down in this behalf. It is for the Chair to give a ruling. So far as we are concerned, we consider any person who is in the Chair to be the Speaker for this purpose. The other paper also had been submitted to the Chair by the hon. Member. You were pleased to say that the hon. Speaker has not seen that. Whether he has submitted it in time in order to enable the Speaker to see it and give his opinion on it, is the point. If he has not given the hon. Speaker due time, then of course the hon. Member would have been remiss in his duty. But if he has done it in time, he has given so much time to the Speaker as would enable him to give his opinion on it and even then the Speaker has not given his opinion on it—if that is so—I must say the Chair has been remiss in this matter; it is not the Member who has been remiss. Even if the hon. Speaker had been remiss in this matter, he has been slack in this, you will excuse me for using these words, then at least, you who happen to be in the Chair have to exercise judgment on behalf of this office. Time is precious and we attach the greatest importance to laying the document on the Table of the House. We are now keen that the document should be laid on the Table of the House. So you have to give an opinion. The document has been authenticated. There is nothing of a defamatory nature. There are rules which have been quoted:

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are going beyond the point of order.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I have also seen that document.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: We have not seen it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: My point of order is this. As far as laying of documents on the Table is concerned, the permission of the Chair is required; it is true. In this case, Mr. Bosu has sent both the documents in due time to the correct person, i.e. the Speaker. The Speaker has seen only one and not the other, when both the documents were in his custody. Today he is speaking on the Appropriation Bill. Laying of the document will become useless after the Bill is passed. So, the discussion on this Bill should be held over till the Speaker take a decision. Otherwise, if the discussion goes on and he is allowed to lay only one document on the Table, this is something extraordinary. I want your ruling on this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The first one cannot be laid because the Speaker should call me to say a few things under Direction 115; today it is not possible. I will try to raise it tomorrow. About the second one, the enclosure was handed over by me personally to a responsible officer of the Secretariat and I have seen an official at the Table taking it to Mr. K. R. Ganesh long before lunch. So, it has been seen and fully examined. As pointed out by Shri Mishra and Shri Banerjee, unless you allow me to lay it on the Table, it loses its value. So, would you be considerate enough to act within your powers under the rules, keeping in mind the interest of the House, the interest of the members and the interest of those who have sent us here?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Raipur): There are two documents, makes the situation quite imple. It been seen by the Speaker and the other has not been seen. That actually makes the situation quite simple. If he has not seen the document, there

is no embarrassment for you as far as the second document is concerned. You can take a decision yourself on it and accordingly guide the hon member.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR Mr Bosu referred to Direction 115

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Direction 115 has no relation with his case

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR Sir he mentioned Direction 115 It reads thus

A member wishing to point out any mistake or inaccuracy in a statement made by a Minister or any other member shall before referring to the matter in the House write to the Speaker pointing out the particulars of the mistake or inaccuracy and seek his permission to raise the matter in the House"

So there must be a prior statement by a minister and there should be an inaccuracy in it and he should be able to point out the particulars of the mistake. These are essential prerequisites. Then and then alone he can raise it. I do not know under what rule or direction he is doing it when this matter is not at all under discussion in any of the Demands

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER I think the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU has got the wrong end of the stick

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Well I should not use that expression. He has mixed up the two papers

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU As he always does.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER About the first paper, to which you obviously referred, when speaking of the discrepancy or inaccuracy, the Speaker has seen it and permitted it.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR I am not mentioning anything about the first paper. I have nothing to say on that.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER The controversy is about the second one. He wants to lay it on the Table of the

House. There are two points made by Shri Mishra and Shri Banerjee. The first point is that any person who sits in the chair is the Speaker and, therefore he is competent to take a decision. True, But even so, if I were to take a decision I cannot be reading such an important paper and at the same time, attending to the business of the House. I must do it coolly in my chamber, I have to consider all the implications before I take a decision whether to allow it or not. You expect a man who sits in this chair to act in a most responsible manner. I cannot irresponsibly allow anything. Unless I have studied and considered the paper I cannot do it.

There is another point which was raised by Shri Banerjee. His point is that Shri Bosu had submitted his papers well in time and therefore some decision should have been taken on this and the debate would be meaningless unless and until this point is settled. Therefore they say in order to give time to the Speaker to consider this paper and to come to his decision, the debate could be postponed till tomorrow. This is a decision which I would not like to take myself, I cannot take it myself. I would like the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to help me out. So far as the House is concerned, it is the master of its own procedure. It is up to the House to decide anything in its wisdom.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR I do not know whether it has anything to do with the Demands. We come into the picture only when the Speaker applies his mind under Direction 115A. The directions read

'(2) The member may place before the Speaker such evidence as he may have in support of his allegation

(3) The Speaker may, if he thinks fit, bring the matter to the notice of the Minister or the member concerned for the purpose of ascertaining the factual position in regard to the allegation made."

[SHRI RAJ BAHADUR]

So, we have not come into the picture. We have not seen the paper.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is exactly the difficulty. The rules are so wide that when a member talks there are so many things which he can say and which by a remote connection are related to this or that demand. Therefore, to say off-hand that this does not relate to the demand is a little difficult for me or for anybody.

The only point is whether the House will agree to its postponement. If the House does not agree, it ends there.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR. We do not agree.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER I think the House wants to go on with the debate.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I want to submit for your kind reconsideration one point. Earlier you had asked the member whether he had conformed to the requirements of the rule or not. Now we are pointing out that the chair is not conforming to the rules of the debate.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Member has given the notice to the Speaker. He has also enclosed the paper with it. This letter written by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu today, the 27-11-1972, was received at the Parliamentary Notice Office at 10 a.m. He has given certain enclosures. Among the enclosures is one paper which he wants to lay on the Table of the House. Now, the Speaker has seen this paper and he has given the permission. With regard to the second paper, there has been no letter enclosing this...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: My goodness!

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: At least this is not before me. This is in relation to the first paper. In relation to the second paper, I have not seen any

covering letter. If he has given it, let me ascertain from him now at what point of time today he has given a letter enclosing the second paper

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: My letter reads as follows....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: At what time did you submit it?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The letter was sent before 10 O'Clock together with this document. Let it be examined. This is my office copy. If you have any trust and reliance on the Member of the House, here is an office copy I can send it to you through the Marshal.

I had made a special point that I wanted to lay this particular document so as to show how Government money is being used for the purpose of party interests, the Prime Minister's meeting, something like that.....
(Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. Don't go beyond that. I am not allowing that point. We have not reached that point. This is a point of order. Don't go beyond the point of order. I do not know what he said. While I was busy looking into this letter, he said something to which objection was taken. I will have to examine it. If there is anything which is against the rules, that will have to go. I will look into that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: As far as the notice part is concerned, both these letters of notice were sent together. I am saying it on my own responsibility. You can check it up from the office. I have produced an office copy of that letter before you. If somebody is now trying to mis-lay the paper... (Interruptions). Only the other day you had seen that a paper was not brought to the Table... (Interruptions). I am saying it on my own responsibility that both the letters of notice were delivered at the same

time at your Parliamentary Notice Office. Therefore, there could be no reason as to why there should be two different treatments to be meted out because one is embarrassing to the Government. Is that the reason? There are clear rules....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I know the rules.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have a feeling that you have lost sight of the rules. I am sorry to say that. There is Rule 369. It is very clear. The rules are supreme as far as the House is concerned and as far as you are concerned. Neither we can function outside the rules nor you can function outside the rules.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nobody is making that suggestion.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Rule 369(1) (1) says:

"A paper or document to be laid on the Table shall be duly authenticated by the member presenting it." I have done it. Then, it says:

"(2) All papers and documents laid on the Table shall be considered public."

The rules are supreme. I have acted according to rules. I am entitled to lay the paper on the Table of the House. If you wish to act within your rightful powers, you cannot prevent me from doing so. If you act outside the rules, it is on your own responsibility.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Bosu has quoted Rule 369. I would like to draw his attention to another rule. Now, wherever anything has not been specifically provided by the Rules, then it has to be provided by the Directions of the Speaker, and the Speaker has given clear directions as to when a paper can be laid on the Table of the House. You have to go through that

procedure and when permission is given, then the other things come in. Therefore, this Rules does not apply.

Now, I think we have reached a rather serious point. The hon. Member has made a serious statement just now. It has to be looked into. He has said—I have not seen it—that he has given a covering letter forwarding the second document before 10 A.M. to-day. I am telling you, Mr. Bosu, this is a serious statement you are making, that the covering letter was delivered before 10 A.M. along with the other notice... (*Interruptions*). Let us not mix up between the two. One covering letter enclosing the first document is here. It was received at 10 in the morning. I am talking about the covering letter forwarding your second document. You have given me here a copy of a letter which is addressed to the Speaker purporting to enclose the second document, but, there is nothing to mention here as to at what point of time this has been given and received. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Do you write it on the letter?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Never.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In a way, he said a stam... (*Interruptions*) Order please. Anyway, I say, this has to be looked into. Now, if the Member has given the things in time, I think he has done it correctly according to the Rule. But, still, the position remains that unless and until the Speaker has considered it and has given the permission, it cannot be laid. I am concerned with that just now.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: rose.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No more please. The decision is that the second document cannot be laid because the Speaker has not considered it and he has not given his permission.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: This is your wilful neglect of that document? We have to take serious note of the behaviour of the Chair. Is it wilful blindness?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I don't know about that. It is upto you.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Kindly expunge the words 'wilful blindness'. (Interruptions) He should be made to withdraw it... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please. I can only say this, that I cannot take a decision on an important paper like this, seeing it for the first time, sitting in this Chair, attending to the business of the House. I cannot be expected to act in an irresponsible manner... (Interruptions) Order, please. If the Member says that because the Chair wants to act in a responsible manner it is blindness, let it go on record... (Interruptions) I am not going to act in an irresponsible manner. If responsibility is equated with blindness by the Member it is for the House to decide about it. I, for one, will not agree that responsibility goes together with blindness. I will act in a responsible manner. Therefore, I will not allow this paper to be laid.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Those words must be expunged. He should be made to withdraw those words... (Interruptions).

SHRI K. N. TIWARY (Bettiah): Is your decision challenged, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No more point of order, please.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I refer to the Directions of the Speaker. I say once again that a letter of notice was delivered to the Parliament office before 10 O' Clock. Let it go on record. Letter of notice—note the word.

Now, if you come to Direction 115 sub-para 2... I do not know why the

Chair is so anxious to do things which are not at all, we feel, helpful. Just look at the freedom which is given here; you want to deny me even that. Sir, you have never even suggested this. It says:

"If, in the course of his speech, a member wishes to lay a paper or document on the Table without previously supplying a copy thereof to the Speaker, he may hand it over at the Table...."

You have not afforded me even that much minimum thing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am on my legs.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am on my legs. Order please. These are the rules. When the Chair is on its legs, the Member must sit down.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I was in the midst of making my submission; you get up suddenly:

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have made your point. You have made your point that if in the course of his speech, a member wishes to lay a paper, he may hand it over to the Chair for consideration.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I expected that much.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have not come to that stage yet. We have not even started the debate. If in the course of your speech you want to lay a particular paper, naturally, I will ask you to hand it over to me; but I am telling you again, that stage has not come yet. Why do you say, I have not allowed it? (Interruptions)

No more discussion. This is over. Shri S. M. Banerjee:

SHRI MUHAMMED KHUDA BUKHSH (Murshidabad) Shri Mishra in his point may have made remarks about the Chair which may be charitable or uncharitable. It is for you to judge. But is it proper for him to ask the Chair to take serious notice of the conduct of the Chair? (Interruptions)

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Order please

DR KAI IAS (Bombay South) Those words should be expunged

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER I am not accepting that because I would like that to go on record that a Member said that responsibility is blindness. (Interruptions) I prefer to be blind but act with responsibility

SHRI SHI AMNANDAN MISHRA If the Chair exercises its judgment in one case and not in the other the conclusion would be that the negligence is that of the Chair

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU They will expunge themselves, nothing will save them!

SHRI S M BANERJEE (Kanpur) Mr Deputy Speaker Sir I would only try to raise one or two issues which were not covered at the time of the discussion on the Supplementary Grants

I was surprised to see that these Supplementary Demands did not provide any amount, not even a crore of rupees for the like'y increased wages for the Central Government employees after the submission of the Pay Commission's report. I was expecting that the budget for 1972-73

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRI C SUBRAMANIAM) He can raise any point saying that it has not been included here

SHRI S M BANERJEE This is nothing against the Prime Minister. So why should he be irritated?

We were told in this House by Shri K R Ganesh and the other House was also told that by the end of this year, the Pay Commission was expected to submit its report. Naturally we expect Government to have provided some money for implementing the recommendations of the Pay Commission. The absence of any such provision clearly means that the Pay Commission's tenure is likely to be extended and the apprehension or fear lurking in the minds of

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU I have done my job. People have understood the skeleton in the cupboard

SHRI S M BANERJEE It means that the fear lurking in the minds of the Central Government employees numbering about 28 lakhs and also the employees in the Army, Navy and Air Force has come true namely that the report is not likely to be submitted by the end of this year. I would request therefore the hon Minister Shri K R Ganesh to realise the gravity of the situation and realise what will happen if the Pay Commission does not submit its report even by the end of this year. November is almost over. The end of this year would mean the end of December, 1972. There are clear indications that the Pay Commission is not going to submit its report. We were told that they were going to submit the report in instalments. But not even one instalment has been submitted, and after getting three instalments of interim relief, the minimum salary of the Central Government employees is only Rs 170 whereas an employee in a public sector undertaking is getting a minimum salary ranging from Rs 210 to Rs 240. Since no amount has been provided for in these Demands, I would request the

[SHRI S. M. BANERJEE]

hon. Minister to give us a clear assurance on this matter, because the railway employees are taking a strike ballot on the issue of bonus, and the defence employees are also preparing for a similar thing on the bonus issue.

The prices are rising every day. The more we discuss this question, the more the prices rise, and I feel that it is no use discussing it here in this House. The hon. Minister here makes a statement which has nothing to do with reality. Since they are unable to hold the price-line, the Central Government employees today will definitely demand the early submission of the Pay Commission's report and its implementation.

Another question that I would like to raise is this. What will happen to those Central Government employees who have retired in 1971-72 or who are likely to retire in the months of November and December, 1972? Nearly 40,000 to 50,000 Central Government employees will be retiring, and unless the report is implemented retrospectively, they will not get any benefit out of that.

There is a growing discontent among the 28 lakhs of the Central Government employees on this issue. I would appeal to the hon. Minister to read between the lines. The line between hunger and anger is becoming thinner. The prices are rising, and again and again, Government are unable to stop it. So, I would appeal to the hon. Minister to state here categorically that the Pay Commission will be asked to submit its report. When I had made a remark in this connection, some of my hon. friends became angry with me. I said that unless alternative jobs were provided to the members of the Pay Commission, they would never submit their report, because it is a question of their bread and butter.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: He is casting aspersions.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Without imputing any motives to them, I say let the Prime Minister assure them of alternative jobs. We are against retrenchment. So, let them be provided with alternative jobs, but let them not delay the submission of the report only because their own livelihood and enjoyments may be affected.

With these words, I would request the hon. Minister to make a statement here on this matter.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I hope you will give me a little time, because I have a number of questions to be covered.

This feature of Supplementary Demands, although it is a very unusual practice, has become a common feature. There are three stages, as you are aware, namely the budget estimates, the revised estimates and the actuals. The regulation of expenditure, as far as this Government is concerned, is non-existent. Nowhere in the world will you find a Government coming up before Parliament so frequently with supplementary demands for grants. They cannot visualise anything, because the hon. Ministers say that they cannot find time to devote to their secretarial work, because they have got to do other work outside the scope of that for keeping themselves alive in politics and things like that.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is wrong with that?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am alarmed at this new indication about the food import. We want Government to spell out clearly their mind as to what this food import is, what the quantity is, what excess price they have agreed to pay—because they have agreed to some excess price—and what the commercial basis is. So far, so long this PL 499—what was it, was it on a charitable basis? I do not really know because those documents have never been laid on the Table.

there with strings. But we want to know what is this new commercial basis they are talking about. An eminent economist has said:

"All this leaves out of the reckoning the parallel economy which thrives in clandestine deals and operations. In my view, this parallel economy poses a serious threat to the stability and growth of the official economy because the magnitude of black money is large and growing at a much faster rate than the Government cares to admit. My studies of the problem suggest that the rate of growth of black money is somewhat higher than the rate of growth of national income".

We can well imagine it when we know that the magnitude of the black money is around Rs. 12,000 crores at least. But this Government are having peaceful sleep. They are not worried. The parallel economy has grown bigger than the national income economy. Because, this party survives politically on black money. Their leader is the leader of black money. That is why black money survives so well.

Then I come to deficit financing. There is a RBI warning which says:

"Under budgetary operations, starting with the operations of the Central and State Governments, their overall budget deficit amounted to Rs. 631 crores in 1971-72".

SHRI K. R. GANESH: May I point out that he is now speaking on the Appropriation Bill? But he is going into the entire question of the economy black money etc. which have no connection with the Demands for grants we are seeking.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Of course.

SHRI K. R. GANESH: He can stretch anything. Because he was not present

during the general debate, he is talking advantage of this opportunity. I leave it to you for decision. But this is my submission. He is also going into the question of food imports and so on

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order order Shri Bosu knows the rule. The entire question of economic policy cannot be gone into now.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: At times I do not understand the rules.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The principles underlying the mam demands or the basic demands cannot be brought into discussion on the supplementary demands. This relates only to those limited demands with which Government have come before the House. Now you are going into the basic question of black money, parallel economy and all that. These are basic questions. They do not come within the purview of these limited supplementary demands.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why should they come with supplementary demands?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Therefore, you cannot talk on those things.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I can.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. Rules do not permit that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Kindly read out loudly the points I have given to you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Simply because you have sent a note saying that you want to talk on these points, it does not mean that all these come within the purview of this discussion.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I might as well go and live in peace.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: One of the items in this note is parallel economy. It is a big economic question. How does it come within the limited purview of the supplementary demands?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU I have informed you.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER Simply because you have informed me, it does not become relevant.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU If you find that my attacks are too brutal, I will .

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Do not impute anything I am here to regulate the proceedings of the House I am only pointing out the rule I would like you to be more relevant more pointed and more effective

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU I do not wish to beat my own drum I try to be as relevant as possible

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER Please adhere to the rules

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU I am talking on deficit financing which I am entitled to say because everytime they are coming with supplementary demands as a Member of this House, I have a right to point out these things It says

"Starting with the operation of the Central Government and the State Governments, their overall budget deficit amounted to Rs 631 crores in 1971-72, thus showing a considerable deterioration from the position in 1970-71 accounts when the overall deficit amounted to Rs 431 crores, compared to the budget estimate for the year 1971-72, the deficit was higher by Rs 244 crores, etc.

This is the Reserve Bank's warning, and if, they like, they can go through this and not feel irritated when I tell them all these things.

The Reserve Bank again says—

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it relevant?

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I can only point out to the Member, but I cannot be so strong like a school master and tell him "this much and no other" I expect the co-operation of the hon Member If he persists in spite of this—

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU. I am not persisting I have gone to a different subject

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER I have already pointed out that it is irrelevant

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU I am now perpendicular, not parallel

'First, the monetary expansion will have to be kept within limits, and second, institutional facilities will have to be provided on an extensive scale to mobilise the savings of the community The essential element of controlling monopoly expansion would be to limit deficit financing resorted to by the public sector'

I now come to the Planning Commission's fourth Plan Mid-term Appraisal It is clearly stated therein that deficit financing in 1969-70 amounted to only Rs 58 crores—Mr Subramaniam he is not there—and in view of the step-up in the Plan outlay in 1970-71, it rose to Rs 365 crores in that year For the current year, it is placed at Rs 383 crores allowing for deficit financing Rs 200 crores a year for the next two years. As mentioned earlier, the deficit for the total plan period has been taken at Rs 1,200 crores a year or Rs 350 crores more than originally envisaged. That is the position However irritated they may feel, it is not going to help anybody in this matter.

Again, it says:

"What is significant in the present case is while the volume of credit per year has soared in conditions of falling output and disrupted the

distribution system, in 1971-72 we saw a war, a massive influx of refugees, and equally large efforts involved in reconstructing and rehabilitating a new nation. Deficit financing has been as large as Rs. 700 crores, a level unmatched in recent years. With the new tradition of consumption and mismanagement, even in conditions of peace and relative political stability in the region, the Centre threatens to wind up .." (Interruptions) "the large deficit financing of Rs. 400 to Rs. 500 crores."

I will come to the next one, the non-developmental expenditure, which is actually killing us. In fact, it has killed me. (Interruption) This is the non-developmental expenditure on revenue account of the Central Government towards the cost of collection and taxes and duties. In 1950-51, it was Rs 10.2 crores. In 1972-73, it is Rs. 67.79 crores General Administration; it was Rs 89 crores, and in 1972-73 it has become Rs. 50 39 crores. Police: it was Rs. 3 crores in 1950-51; now, it is Rs. 120.43 crores Debt services: it was Rs. 37.4 crores then, and it has come up to Rs. 730 crores. The total public debt in 1960-61 was Rs. 4,735 crores, and in 1972-73, it has become Rs. 16,082 crores. The debts raised in India, in 1961, were Rs. 3,974 crores; it has now come up to Rs. 8,754 crores in 1972-73. The foreign debt raised outside India: Rs. 761 crores in 1960-61; Rs. 7,328 crores in 1972-73. That is the position.

And the growth of monopolies; (Interruptions) You do not want me to speak? Is it irrelevant? Am I causing too much blistering?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: They are irrelevant to the supplementary demands.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You need not express in so many words. The growth of monopolies is another thing. See how they have grown.

From about Rs. 505 and odd crores in 1966, Tatas have reached Rs. 638.5 crores by 1969-70. From about Rs. 93 crores in 1969-70. Mafatlals have reached Rs. 115 crores. If we take into account all the figures in our possession, you will see that the rate of growth of Mafatlals touches almost 75 per cent. But what about the workers' wages, compared to the growth of these monopolies? How they have come down! It says here: 'another impression which is now corroborated by the present compilation of data relates to rise in manufacture and wage costs in recent years; as you observe from Table II, while the manufacturing expenses as a percentage of value of production at current prices of the large public limited companies have by and large remained the same at or around 55 per cent during six years from 1965-66 to 1970-71, the wage costs including the employees welfare expenses have declined marginally from 14 to 13.2 per cent'. This is the class character of this Government. On a survey of 1500 companies it has been revealed that their assets have risen from Rs 4319 crores to Rs. 6439 crores. Foreign establishments are making hay while the sun shines. Their assets in 1968-69 were Rs. 1234 crores and they have risen by about 25 per cent in two years. Turn-over on sales has risen by about fifty per cent. They are making a mess of the whole thing.

Unfortunately this Government has a class character of its own. They will come every time with some supplementary demands; they want more and more money and they want to fleece people by taxation. I was trying to draw your attention to a glaring thing, this document, Till 1969 when the Prime Minister went on tours to address meetings the expenses were paid for by Government. But for election meetings....

SHRI K. R. GANESH: It is entirely irrelevant, he is trying to bring it by the backdoor.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I want to lay it on the Table of the House. From 1969 they have changed the whole thing and now even the election tour expenses of the Prime Minister will be covered by the State....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would again draw your attention to the rules.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You cannot catch me; I say by official designation. But what is the rule number?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: 353. No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It is neither defamatory nor is it an allegation.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER ...shall be made by a Member against any person—the Prime Minister is a person—unless the Member has given previous intimation to the Speaker. If you want to make an allegation, you should have given previous notice that you are going to make this allegation, and also to the Minister concerned. Now the Minister concerned is the Minister of Finance; he should have given notice to him.

“...and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply.

Provided that the Speaker may at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the House or that no public interest is served by making such allegation.”

You have not given this notice.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You are misleading the House, I am very sorry to say. I have given it at 12 o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have given notice of a paper to be laid on the Table. If you want to put it in the form of an allegation....

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): What is the allegation?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If I say what is the allegation, it goes on record. But everybody knows it. You have not given notice under the rules to the Speaker or to the minister concerned.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have not made any kind of allegation. You are not being fair to me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is my opinion that what you say is a kind of allegation of a defamatory nature, which ought to be enquired into. Therefore, I request you not to persist and continue with this. If you continue with this, I will have to be under the painful necessity of ordering that this will not go on record.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: May I read out a Government circular?

SHRI K. R. GANESH: I rise on a point of order. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am not yielding; it is an extract from the Blue Book.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Very often I have found that when a minister on this side of the House speaks, members on this side get up and intervene, and very often I have seen the ministers yielding and listening to that member. I am only saying that the same courtesy may be shown to this side of the House. When a member of the opposition speaks and a minister wants to intervene, I think it is within parliamentary practice to show the courtesy of listening to him.

This is only a courtesy. Of course, if a member does not yield, the Minister cannot say anything. But it is a parliamentary practice and it is only courtesy. But when Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu is speaking and the Minister wants to intervene, there is immediately a chorus of protests from the opposition. What is the impression created? The impression created is that you are in a precarious condition and that you do not want even to listen to the argument. . . (*Interruptions*). Before you go on, show him the courtesy.

16.00 hrs.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Under your residuary power, you cannot compel me to yield.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am only requesting you.

SHRI K R GANESH: The submission I was making is this. The entire speech that the hon. Member had made had nothing to do with the estimates or demands.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, you should use your power to expunge this sentence.

SHRI K. R. GANESH: Sir, he is trying to introduce by the backdoor what you have not permitted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before we began this debate, it is over this very paper that so much of discussion and points of orders were raised and I have given my ruling that this cannot be allowed to be laid on the Table of the House. Now you are trying to bring the whole thing on record.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, I want to read a government circular on money matters.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is the same paper that you are trying to bring up again.

2610 LS.—11.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Am I not entitled to read a government circular?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If you are reading a government circular which is so simple and innocent that nobody can take objection, then there is no difficulty. But this particular paper is under the consideration of the Speaker for laying on the Table of the House. The moment it is laid it becomes a public document. The moment you put it on record, it becomes a public document.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, there is a limit to your pleading for the Treasury Benches. If you want, you can throw me out; I care less. But your attempt to cover the Treasury Benches is exceeding the limit. . . (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am concerned with the rules.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Telling me under what specific rule? This is done in your anxiety to protect the Treasury Benches. I am putting it straight on record. . . (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I was going to say that if it is a government circular, there cannot be any objection to it. But when a particular paper, which includes the government circular, is under consideration of the Speaker and I have already given a ruling that it cannot be laid on the Table, I cannot allow the same thing to be brought again by the backdoor. Therefore, I again say that I will be under the painful duty of expunging it. . . (*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu has submitted a paper which the Speaker has seen. Now what do we actually find? What is the special document? This is an extract from the

[SHRI S. M. BANERJEE]

rules, how to protect the Prime Minister in the meetings, the security arrangements to be taken for protecting the Prime Minister....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: At whose cost?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are bringing in the same thing.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why not? We pay for it.... (Interruptions) We shall see how the House moves.... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: My point of order is this. This document is neither confidential nor secret. It is an extract from the rules, from the blue book....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Not blue films!

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I am not interested in blue films.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Confine yourself to the point of order.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I can assure you I will not read it. This is for the protection of the Prime Minister. Sir, you will remember that Dr. Lohia published a book—Rs. 25,000 per day on the Prime Minister. That has been openly published. That was repudiated by Shri Morarji Desai when he was the Deputy Prime Minister. This hush-hush business, not allowing Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, to read it creates an impression that there is something fishy there. Let it be laid on the Table of the House.

SOME HON MEMBERS rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Kindly sit down. I will listen to everybody. I am trying to regulate the proceedings. I am not shutting out anybody.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You are shutting me out.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not shutting out anybody. This is the point of order that is being discussed now. I would like the Minister to listen carefully and let us discuss it as to what is to be done.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu was trying to read out a particular rule from the blue book which concerns the security and the other expenses of the Prime Minister. I think, this will not be covered under rule 353 which you read out and which says that if certain statement is defamatory or incriminatory, it should not be allowed. This is neither defamatory nor incriminatory. This is only a rule published by the Government which is read out by a particular Member and which concerns the security and the other expenses of the Prime Minister....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't go into the contents of it. We are discussing exactly this point. If I allow you to mention everything, what is the point in listening to the point of order?

SHRI G VISWANATHAN: This is not a private document as if it is placed by any particular Member of the House. This is a circular issued by the Government. I think, every body has got the right to read it in the House and quote from it.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): My submission is that although this circular to which a reference has been made includes also a reference to the election meetings, it should not prevent a Member from laying it on the Table of the House or from reading it. My further submission in this connection is that, the Prime Minister uses planes. That is permitted, in a sense, by all of us—even for the election meetings. She

goes in planes even to election meetings. But that is a rule which has been accepted and we have not been able to get it abrogated till now in spite of the best efforts we have made in that direction. But, it is nobody's contention at the moment that if the Prime Minister uses the plane for going to the election meetings, that will have a repercussion on the election expenses and so on. Nobody has made that contention.

Now, similarly, if it is out of consideration for the safety of the Prime Minister and if it is the concern of the State to look after Prime Minister's safety as it has been pointed out to be then, it is a matter which goes beyond the elections. They only limited point the hon. Member wants to make to the House is that there is an amendment of the earlier rule in this respect.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Yes.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: Whatever interference has to be drawn, I do not want to be very technical about it. I do not know whether it is of great help. But the only limited point for consideration is: whether any hon. Member can bring to your notice or to the notice of the House that there has been an amendment to the earlier rule in this respect. May be the amendment has been undertaken by the best of considerations for the office of the Prime Minister, whoever occupies it. So, my submission is that the hon. Member must be permitted to refer to that amendment and it should not irritate anybody because it does not do any harm to anybody.

SHRI R. V. BADE (Kharagone): My submission is that we are making much ado about nothing. It has been made for the protection of the Prime Minister. Why should there be so much fuss about the notification and why is the Minister so much touchy about it? Therefore, I think in the interests of justice and, it is the duty of the Parliament also, that it should be laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): I want to understand why a circular which is a Government circular, which is not marked 'Confidential', is open to any objection, because it is a public document, it is meant to be generally known to anybody who is interested in that subject and who wishes to raise it. It is not as if it were a confidential document. If it were a confidential document, then, undoubtedly, one may have to consider what weight to give to it. This is all the submission that I wish to make.

This is a circular which is not confidential. Then, to my mind it is open to anybody who is interested in the subject matter of that circular, to refer to it. If it were a confidential circular, then undoubtedly, the question would arise as to what the contents are and should it be allowed to be put on the Table of the House. As you said, when you put something on the Table of the House, it becomes a public document. It is already a public document.

SHRI HUKAM CHAND KACHWAI (Morena) rose.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will permit you only on condition that you will not shoot up suddenly and use your lung power.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: When there is no quorum, he has to.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : हमारे प्रधान मंत्री की रक्षा के जो नियम हैं उन से सारे देश को जानकारी होनी चाहिये और इस पत्र के अन्दर वही बातें कहीं गई हैं। इस लिये इस पत्र को पढ़ने की आज्ञा दी जानी चाहिये।

SHRI K. R. GANESH: The objection which was raised was confined to two points. Firstly, you had earlier ruled that this second document which

[SHRI K. R. GANESH]

Shri Bosu gave to you would not be placed on the Table of the House because you wanted to consider it.

Secondly, he is bringing the same document in the form of submission which he is making... (*Interruptions*). Please hear me. In the form of submission he is making, he is bringing it. There is nothing secret about the document. The document is there. These are meant for the security of the Prime Minister. That is not under discussion. His whole speech has no relevance to the Demands that we are seeking. (*Interruptions*). What is this, I say? You go on speaking most irrelevant things and you cannot listen just for one minute of what I say? Have you become so weak? You don't allow me to complete my submission. Mr. Deputy Speaker, these are my two submissions, Sir.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: On a point of order, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a point of order, which is under discussion. There cannot be another point of order when this point of order is being discussed. What is it that you want?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Kindly sit down; I will tell you just now. Sir, my point is this. A piece of paper or a document may be laid on the Table or it may go to the library and it may be made available to other Members. That is one thing. Making a speech is entirely a different thing. I want to quote from a proper circular to show how Government money is being misused or mis-utilised for furthering party interests. A rule which was in existence, since 1969, has been changed. That has been changed to the advantage of the ruling party. Don't you think in a democratic institution, I have got the right, as a tax-payer, as Shri Mishraji has got the right, or as you have got the right, ask about it? The second thing is this: There is nothing to hide in this. The House and the peo-

ple of the country should know that this was good enough before 1969 for two Prime Ministers. But why is this not enough for the present one? Now the expenses have to be debited to the State Exchequer instead of the ruling party. In the name of security this is a fraud that is going on. I have a right to say what I want to say, I have a right to expose the whole thing. If you don't permit me to lay it on the Table of the House, that is one thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't presume.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: So far as Rule 353 is concerned, I have made no allegation at all against anybody. I am quoting from an extract. I am quoting from a Government circular authenticated as a 'true copy'. I have made no defamatory, or incriminatory or derogatory references. Rule 353 does not touch me at all. You are unnecessarily getting worried under a ghost's shadow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Kindly listen to me carefully and quietly.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Why do not you read the paper?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I know Mr. Banerjee is a very senior Member.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What is incriminatory in this?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Banerjee is a senior Member; I agreed that he is perhaps the wittiest Member in the House. I agree to be careful when I move with him. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Genesh has raised two objections. One is on the point of relevancy. I have pointed out to Mr. Bosu from the very beginning that most of the things he said...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: At one point only...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I don't know how many times, but I have said, they do not fall within the purview of the Supplementary Demands and I said most of the things were irrelevant. But I also have pleaded

helplessness. When I point out something to the Member, if he persists in irrelevancy, then, there is a limit for the Chair also to exercise its power. And, moreover, if relevancy is to be applied, I am afraid, some eighty per cent of our speeches will be irrelevant! We cannot just apply the rule of relevancy. I do not think anything can be expunged on the point of irrelevancy. I can only check the Member. I cannot expunge anything that he has raised on the ground of irrelevancy.

But this is a very special case, a very very funny and confusing situation in which....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Too Many skeletons.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order. Let him kindly listen to me carefully. He had sent a certain paper to the Hon. Speaker for his consideration and permission to be laid on the Table of the House. We had discussed that at the very beginning, and it was pointed out to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu that this paper was still under the consideration of the Speaker. Whether he would give the permission or not to him....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Why did he send the paper? It should not have been sent.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu has sent this paper and it is under consideration.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I do not know.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We discussed this at the very beginning before we began the discussion on the Appropriation Bill, and I had given a ruling that because the Speaker was still considering this document, it could not be laid on the Table of the House. Now, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu comes forward....

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: It must have been considered by this time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If he has considered it, then let him inform me that he has given him permission. Then, everything is over.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: What is the use of this after the whole debate is over?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In the same debate, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu wants to bring the same thing on record, when the very same thing is under the consideration of the Speaker. Now, it is a funny situation. A little while ago, I had ruled that this was under the consideration of the Speaker, and now I am asked to allow everything to come on record, the very same thing that is under consideration....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It is dialectics.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not want, therefore, to pre-empt the decision of the Speaker by allowing this to come on record. On that ground alone, I cannot give permission....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: May I rise on a point of order? If an hon. Member in his first thought comes to the conclusion that it should be submitted to the Chair for its consideration as to whether a particular document should be allowed to be laid on the Table of the House or not—suppose that is his first thought—and then he revises it saying, 'Probably, I have been stupid in asking for the permission; I do not require any permission of the Speaker at all, because it happens to be an official circular; this is a public document, and, therefore, I do not require any permission in this connection, let me read out from the circular. I would like to know whether it is not given to the hon. Member to give a second thought to it and read out from the circular. What you are confronted with at the present moment is this simple issue whether an hon. Member can read out from a Government circular which is a public document, and which as Shri H. M. Patel has pointed out, has not been marked confidential. This is the limited question with which you are confronted now.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: Under rule 10, may I submit....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: This circular is not defamatory but it is only inflammatory.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think Shri Shyamnandan Mishra has tried to oversimplify the whole question..

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: No.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If Members would be so sympathetic to the Chair each time to oversimplify things, I would be very grateful to them. If it is a simple question of a Government document which is not confidential, it is a simple question, but here the whole thing is mixed up.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: How?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It refers to the very same document which Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu has sent to the Speaker for his consideration. It is still under the consideration of the Speaker.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Let him withdraw it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House had taken a decision on that just a little while ago. We have taken the decision that it cannot be allowed, and, therefore, it cannot be made public, and it cannot be allowed....

SHRI G. VISHWANATHAN: It is already public.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It cannot be public simply because he has given copies secretly to some hon. Members....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I shall give it openly in Parliament Street. Who can stop me from doing so?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It cannot be allowed and it cannot be made public until the Speaker has considered it. Now, that situation remains. It has not changed. Therefore, unless and until the Speaker takes a decision on this, I cannot allow it to go on record and to be made public....

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: Under rule 10, you, Sir, have the same powers as the Speaker. It refers to the Deputy Speaker or any other member competent to preside over a sitting of the House having the same powers as the Speaker when so presiding....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already dealt with that point.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: If you would have heard the lengthy speech of Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, I think that by this time you would have made up your mind that it is so harmless that there is no harm in permitting it to be read out.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: At that point of time ..

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can go on with your speech. But that will not go on record.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: We will take serious objection to this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We will not allow the House to move.

SHRI K. N. TIWARY: You have given your ruling. I do not understand this new practice that has come into vogue by which that ruling is discussed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Anyway, I have given my ruling that because of this circumstances, this cannot go on record.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Which cannot go on record?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This particular document and the contents of it until Speaker gives his decision.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: May I seek your guidance? Your objection is only this that because the Speaker has not seen it, it cannot be allowed. The document, according to you, has been sent by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu. Perhaps you are aware that he is trying to read from a document. But this has been liberally circulated here.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not aware of that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I gave you a copy. You took a copy from me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Does not matter. This is under the consideration of the Speaker.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: This will create unnecessary suspicion in the minds of the people. This is a public circular of Government, not confidential. The Minister is not defending it as a confidential document.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, order. There is no use wrangling any more.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Would you kindly sit down for one minute?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down first.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: I wish merely to ask this. The effect of your ruling, if I understand it correctly, is that this government's circular cannot be read in this House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, no. You are not giving a correct interpretation. With all your background, I wonder why you say so. I had said that on this limited ground that this very same document is under the consideration of the Speaker and the House has taken a decision on that, it cannot go on record. I did not say that a government document or government circular could not be read in this House—I did not say that.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: This is the same thing.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: So far as you are concerned, you were pleased to say that the Speaker has not seen it and has not given his permission. These are your words. From your words, it cannot be inferred that it is under the consideration of the Speaker, because he has not seen it. He has not seen it—these are the words which have fallen from your lips.

Secondly, I would like to remind you that at an earlier stage you had said—if you go into the record, you will see it, to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: 'I have not disallowed it finally'. Please remember some of these words. These have gone on record.

Now you are confronted with a very simple proposition. The Speaker is not seized of it, because he has not seen it. It may well be that if the Speaker has not seen this document, Shri Bosu would not force it on him now. He is now simply seeking your permission whether a simple government circular could not be quoted from.

SOME HON. MEMBERS ROSE—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let me answer that point.

Shri Mishra started by saying that I have said that the Speaker has not seen it. That is very correct. But does it mean that because the Speaker has not seen it, when an hon. member has sent a document, and when the document has become a subject of discussion in the House, it is not under his consideration? It only means that the Speaker will now see it and consider it. Therefore it is under consideration.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: We do not want him to see it now (Interruptions).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: At that particular point of time when I was trying to read out from that circular, which I am fully entitled to, you quoted rule 353 and said that 'under that rule, I disallow this from going on record'. May I make a request of your goodself? Would you be kind enough to do this? You have got that circular. It is in your possession for the last two hours.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have not been able to apply my mind to it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You say that you have not been able to apply your mind. Right. Will it go on record? It has gone on record. How do you judge this as something defamatory or incriminatory? (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. *Prima facie*, you can take a hurried glance at thing and you can get an impression. You can come to some impression on it. But before giving a decision, you have to consider it fully and consider all its implications and ramifications. (*Interruptions*) Order please. That is my impression. Even so, I say that the whole thing is under consideration. This is the first impression. If you want me to go by the first impression, then I can give my ruling, but I am not saying. (*Interruptions*). Order please. In any case, we have had a discussion. You are in the middle of the speech. Let us dispose of the point. We have had enough of discussion, and enough of wrangling. There is no more point. When a new situation has arisen, the best course for me is to take the pleasure of the House. (*Interruptions*). No more please.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, may I make one submission? My submission is this. Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu was already on his legs, and you yourself said in this House that "I want to consider this coolly and in good temper. I did not get enough time even to consider the document."

What I suggest to you is that Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu might be permitted to continue his speech. There are so many other points to be made. This is only a simple point. On a number of critical situations, you have been pleased to apply your critical mind in no time. This is just a paragraph containing four lines. It only refers to the security arrangements made for the public meeting, and the State Government had to make them. On such a small statement, if you can go through it, you will be able to say that there is nothing defamatory. You could make up your mind if you want to make a reference to that. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. We have had enough discussion. Now, in view of all that has happened, and in view of everything that has been said here in the House over this limited issue, I would like to take the sense of the House—

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: On what?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER:—Whether in view of the fact that this document is now under consideration of the Speaker, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu can bring that document again... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: It would be a very wrong precedent.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let the House take a decision.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : **

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. Nothing of this should go on record.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : **

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I want you to take a decision. Why are you afraid? (*Interruptions*). Order please. In view of the submissions made, a very earnest—

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We are not a party to this. By a brute majority you cannot decide the issue.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: This is creating a very dangerous precedent.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down. Let me first say this. (*Interruptions*). In view of the strong submissions made by the Members on this side of the House that this particular document which is under the consideration of the Speaker should be permitted to be mentioned by Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu and go on record, I would like the House to decide on this matter. I would like to hear the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What has he to say?

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): Our handicap is that we have not seen that document; we do not know the contents of that document.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It was given at 12 O'clock.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: It is an amendment to rule 71(6).

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: This is not fair to us; without proper notice, without a copy being served on us, can we be asked to say something?

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: It is very strange; the Minister says he is not in the know of this. It is an amendment to rule 71(6)... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): He should not be allowed to read it; we are not going to allow this.

DR. KAILAS: When Mr. Bosu had given it to the Speaker and it is under the consideration of the Speaker, it is for the Speaker to decide.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Mr. Raj Bahadur just now said that he had not seen the document. Let Mr. Ganesh stand up and say whether he had seen and read that document or not, even

before the lunch hour; your Table Office had taken a copy to give to Mr. Ganesh.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think this is rather unfortunate. This is a very important discussion and we are bogged down in a wrangle. Now, the Minister says he is not aware. Here is where we need his assistance. If you say, you are not aware, it is very difficult... (*Interruptions*). Now the limited question is this. I am open to the wishes of the House.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: No, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is no longer my decision because I have given my ruling once before and therefore I have to take the pleasure of the House.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: We cannot be a party to this abdication of authority by the Chair.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not abdicating.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: It is the Chair's responsibility to decide on this; it cannot be decided by the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not abdicating my authority because I have given my ruling once.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You have given so many rulings.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: About this particular paper, I have given my ruling once. I cannot change my ruling because I think my ruling is correct.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: In effect you are changing it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: At the same time I have said that the Chair can function only with the co-operation of the House... (*Interruptions*).

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER]

However right I may feel in my ruling, yet I must go along with the House. That is why I said in view of the very strong submission made by you on this particular paper, which I have ruled will not be laid, will not be made public until the Speaker has considered and decided on it—now you want this to be brought on record—and therefore this is a limited question that I want to raise before the House and I shall go by the decision of the House.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: It is a bad precedent if you have to take vote on the ruling of the Chair... (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs says he accepts my ruling and therefore I think the House will go on with the discussion... (*Interruptions*). If you want to challenge this, I would like to take the vote of the House... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA:**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record. I am not seeking a vote on my ruling.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: In effect it comes to that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am only being responsive to the strong demand on the side of the House... (*Interruptions*). Mr. Bosu can continue with his speech but cannot refer to this document. This document will not go on record and if he refers to this document or reads from this document, it will not form part of the record.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You can say that by your authority, you stand by your ruling. But do not take a vote on your ruling; in effect it comes to that.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: Quite apart from anything, the opposition which is always in a minority and at present in a very considerable minority always looks to the Chair for its protection. If you refer it to the House, the

conclusion is foregone. It is for you to protect the opposition's rights. If you say, "I stick to my ruling", that is all right. But referring it to the House and taking a vote on it would not be proper.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have said that I stick to my ruling and my ruling is correct. Therefore, consistent with my ruling, I say that this will not go on record. But when there is such a strong submission, the Chair must also be responsive. That is what I am doing. Therefore, Mr. Bosu kindly go on with your speech but abide by my ruling.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I do not quite understand one thing. You have, more or less, accepted the fact that the opposition has made a very strong case in support of what they wanted to do. Now, to escape from it, if you want to throw us on the face of a brute majority here, do you think as a person in the Chair you are giving the rightful treatment to the opposition?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Come to the Supplementary Demands.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Leave it to me; I know what exactly to say and what not. Let no coal be carried to New Castle.

Before 1969, we had eminent Prime Ministers like Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, and late Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri. We have even had officiating Prime Ministers. Mr. Gulzari Lal Nanda officiated as Prime Minister twice. When they toured the country as Prime Minister, the Government paid for their expenses. But when they went on election tour, the party paid for it. They were well looked after as far as security is concerned. I do not remember that anything had happened which could have made them change the procedure or principle that was governing the whole thing. But suddenly in November, 1969, a brain-wave comes as to how to get the money out of the

people and not out of the party and an amendment had come in the travel rule procedure. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K. R. GANESH: What has it to do with the supplementary demands?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: From 1969, they had been stealthily cutting the pocket of the people to further the cause of the party. The Prime Minister's election meetings which were not being covered as far as the money part was concerned by the State exchequer are now being covered quite stealthily. That is why there is so much of irritation on that side. They have been cutting the pocket of the common starving people, 40 per cent of whom live below the poverty line. What have they done? For the decoration, fabrics, furnishing, tapestry material on the rostrum and a part of the sound equipment, 25 per cent of the cost of that or Rs. 2500, whichever is lower, will be paid by the party. In that way for about a score of meetings they have collected about one lakh rupees. But I can assure you that no meeting addressed by the Prime Minister costs less than Rs. 5 lakhs. Considering all the arrangements, Rs. 5 lakhs is the minimum. They have been cheating the people to the tune of minus Rs. 2,500 or 25 per cent, whichever is less. That is what I want to show. The circular in that document shows...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If he reads the circular, it will not go on record. Let him not read it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: All right, I will quote it from memory; I am not reading it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You cannot say "I am speaking from memory" and then look at the paper and then start speaking.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What a bad day for the government that they have to take shelter under your table! I am telling you that no amount of

money would suffice for this government because half of the money will be stolen for purposes for which it was not given. I am providing one example that when eminent Prime Ministers like the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru could have one particular bandobast, that bandobast is not good enough for one of the succeeding Prime Ministers. Perhaps, I would not like to equate or compare them in terms of value. I am only drawing the attention of the House to the fact that this government is in the habit of stealing money and for the purpose of stealing it never stops anywhere and it has no scruples.

SHRI K. R. GANESH: Sir, leaving all the irrelevancies, as far as this demand is concerned... (*Interruptions*). Sir, he has learnt some phrases. The difficulty with the hon. Member is that he has not gone through the mill of political party. The way he has come into the political movement, he brings with him all the dirt. That is why he speaks like the hon. Member has spoken... (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The hon. Minister has said that when the hon. Member entered the political party he came with all the dirt as a backlog...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It is not only an insult but also an insinuation. Here in this House he is an elected representative. If a Member or Minister says that he has brought all the dirt before he joined the political party, I want a ruling from you, Sir, whether it is parliamentary... (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Have you made your point of order?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I have not yet completed... (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. All of you first sit down. I will listen to you. Mr. Guha said, "I want your ruling." I thought he had made that point of order and I would give my ruling. But immediately everybody gets up and shouts. This is the difficulty.

Prof. Samar Guha, my difficulty is that you are a professor and I have the misfortune to belong to that tribe. We can never be concise and precise. We have an inborn, ingrained, incorrigible capacity of confusing our students and making a simple thing look so complicated.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I strongly protest against the remark of the Chair against the teaching fraternity. I have also belonged to the teaching fraternity. I have never been accused by anybody of creating confusion. I am proud of the fact that I belonged to this tribe. I strongly protest against the remark made.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: I know, you belong to the same tribe, I have to teach science and, I know, the students would not have spared me even for a moment if I had digressed....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, come to your point of order.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: What I was pointing out to you was that the Minister accused the Member of carrying dirt before entering into politics. This is a very serious matter. He is an elected representative of the people. It is for the people to judge whether he has carried dirt or not. It is not unknown, on the Treasury Benches, and also in the Ministries, that there are many persons who joined hands with the British Government and we know, they allowed the Indian people to be killed.... (*Interruptions*). They have now got the privilege of sitting on the Treasury Benches. What right has he to say that? We know, there are many persons who joined hands with the imperialists.... (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not a point of order.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: It will be absolutely wrong on your part if you allow this kind of insinuation and undignified remark.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, let me give my ruling on the point of order raised by Prof. Samar Guha.

The whole thing began because Mr. K. R. Ganesh used a certain word—I think, he used the word "dirt". That was objected to by Mr. Bosu and a point of order was raised on that. My ruling is that every Member should try to use as courteous a language as possible to each other. But then that does not happen always. I think a little while ago, when Mr. Bosu was making a speech, he used the word 'steal' with reference to the Government.... (*Interruptions*). Order, please. Now, I think this word is also an unfortunate word.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: He referred to the Government.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: But, all the same, it has gone on record.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It must be expunged?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Would you like it to be expunged?... (*Interruptions*). Order, please. I have not expunged that word. It is an unfortunate word.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Very good.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He did not refer to an individual. He referred to the Government.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now you want a ruling to your liking. I have not asked this word to be expunged.

I said that it is an unfortunate word, a strong word. But, I expected the Government to give a befitting reply to that. If you use that word against them and they use the word that you are bringing all the dirt into it, I think one strong word is matched by another strong word....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
No, no.... (Interruptions).

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER, I request that if Mr. Bosu would withdraw the word 'steal', then Mr. Ganesh may also withdraw the word 'dirt'. If you want it to remain, I don't see any objection why this should not remain.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: There was no allegation about any individual.

It was only a reference to the Government.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: But Government is made up of individuals.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I am on a point of order. You were pleased to say that you did not ask for the expunction of the word 'steal' used by the hon. Member. May I tell you that I would repeat it not one time, but hundred thousand times so far as the Government is concerned. And the Chair has a very poor conception of the function of the House.. (Interruptions). Please wait. Parliament has a right to say that the Government has been looting the money, the Government has been raping the Constitution, murdering the civil rights. All these things can be very properly said. May I say that probably we all are functioning in a hyper-sensitive and feudal society where the Chair gives such a ruling, an extra-ordinary ruling of this kind, an implied ruling, that the word 'steal' cannot be used so far as the Government is concerned.... (Interruptions).

Therefore, it is not out of your generosity we will use that word, we

will go on using that word. We do not expect any generosity from the Chair. The second thing is that here a certain word is used against an individual. Would you allow us to use the same word against the hon. Prime Minister? You were so sensitive when we referred to the tours undertaken by the Prime Minister and you did not allow all those words to go on record.... (Interruptions) Here, the word 'dirt' has been used against an hon. Member and you are equating it with the word 'steal' which has been used against the Government as a whole.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:.... which is inanimate.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: This is most extra-ordinary. My insistence would be that the word 'dirt' used by the Minister, Mr. Ganesh, must be expunged. If you are not expunging it, we will walk out of the House.... (Interruptions).

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, so many times allegations have been made in this House against the CPM. He replied to those allegations. No body said that those words should be expunged. In this House some are described as stooges of Anglo-American imperialism, some are described as Soviet stooges, some are described as Chinese stooges, but they are related to the organisations. So, between the individual and the Government we must always discriminate and allegations against the Government cannot be equated with the allegations against an individual.

17 hrs.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Sir, I have got a submission to make....

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: May I speak on behalf of my party?

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): You have referred to many professors; kindly listen to me also Sir!

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: May I say on behalf of my party that we shall

[Shri Raj Bahadur]

be the first to observe all the rules of decency, decorum, and good and pleasant behaviour towards our friends, because they are our friends first and they are our friends last. We are all devoted and dedicated to democracy. I would ask my friend to withdraw that word, although it is not unparliamentary. But I would then also ask: Is it possible for us as human beings to reach each other's hearts if you call us by all types of names, like "leader of black money", "stealing", "looting" and all that? Will you reach our hearts? Democracy has to function by discussion, not by hurling abuses against each other. I would say this. Once for all I promise, we undertake on behalf of the party, not to use a harsh word to you. According to established practice we should address each other as "Hon. Members" and not as "thieves" or "liars". We cannot do that.

Will Mr. Mishra Ji respond to it, by following a code of conduct between ourselves, by addressing each other in a way that shows respect for each other?

If you state your facts in an honourable way we shall certainly answer them in the same spirit. Well, Sir, we are not angles. We are bound to earth as human beings and if in temper or in heat...

SHRI K. R. GANESH: No, no; not in temper.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: He says, it is not in temper that he used. It is because he is hurt. Therefore, he has said that.

Sir, I would still appeal to Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu. He alone vitiates the atmosphere by the use of these harsh words (*Interruptions*). I will stick to that. He is the one person who does it most. I would say this in all humility. I would say that if Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu can refrain from these epithets...

SHRI YOTIRMOY BOSU: I have, not seen a cypher Minister like you.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: You have given me a compliment. A cypher represents the universe in metaphysical terms. A cypher in mathematical terms represents anything from 'zero' to 'infinity'. In physical terms, it represents my friend Mr. Piloo Mody who is not here now. So, I don't mind this compliment being given to me by Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu.

I ask: Can you not make this Parliament look better. Can we not give a better impression to our young people who really look to us for inspiration? I appeal to you. We shall not use any abusive terms but must also follow the same rule and the same dictum.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR. May I make a few submissions?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No submissions. This is Point of Order.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: The hon'ble Minister of Parliamentary Affairs started by telling this House—and particularly the Members on the opposition benches that he expected decency and decorum from this House. I fully endorse his wish.

Now, it is true that I am a new Member in this House, but let me say, in all humility, I am not new to the Parliamentary procedure and practice.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are already in the game!

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I must say, I was a bit amazed that the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, in the same breath, should have used the word 'vitiating' which is unparliamentary. We on this side of the house are quite sure and confident that we also want to reciprocate the good sentiments expressed by the hon'ble Minister of the Parliamentary Affairs.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: I do not mind withdrawing that word, but the expression, vitiating the atmosphere, is a very parliamentary expression. I do not feel ashamed of it at all.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I am satisfied and I am grateful.... (Interruptions).

I have not completed what I want to say.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Is he also a professor?

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I am still on my legs.

SHRI RAJ BHADUR: Let him appeal to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu now.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: My point is twofold. The hon. Minister Shri K. R. Ganesh had started by saying that Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu had made several remarks which were irrelevant, but then in the same breath, he has started making irrelevant remarks himself. I want a ruling from you....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There cannot be a ruling on this when another point of order has been raised....

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I want a ruling from you whether a Member of the House can start by saying that some other hon Member had made irrelevant remarks and then himself go on making irrelevant remarks. Secondly, I would like to know whether the Chair by giving a ruling, also by implication, can take part in the political issues of the debate....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no point of order in this.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Now that the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has appealed to the House and to the Opposition, I would only request that the whole situation which has developed to this stage can be improved if Shri K. R. Ganesh withdraws the word gracefully. I would not like to

say that otherwise here would be double standards, because for having used those words, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu had been suspended for two days.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI. In the course of his speech, Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu had used some words and said 'Your leader is the leader of black money.' When he has used such strong words and they are on record, naturally, if the hon. Minister retaliates, there is nothing wrong in that. There is, therefore, no question of his withdrawing it. His observations are on record, and, therefore, there is no question of the hon. Minister withdrawing it.

SHRI K. R. GANESH: Now, I am not going to withdraw it. I would not. If he is not going to withdraw it, I am not going to withdraw it either.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: The hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs had assured us that the hon. Minister would withdraw it. We are ready to reciprocate. So, let him withdraw it.

SHRI K. R. GANESH: I do not.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Let those words also be expunged from Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu's speech. Then, he will also withdraw.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: It was wonderful....

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: Shri Shyamnandan Mishra in his temper and in his heat had said that he would use the word a hundred thousand times...

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: I have come here for that purpose.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: I put it to him whether that is in tune with the true spirit of democracy....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
I have come here for that purpose.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The hon. Minister has made a very good appeal to the Opposition. I would suggest that the hon. Deputy-Speaker should go through the records, and if he finds....

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:...and if he finds that what we have heard him saying that he has brought dirt and all that—I distinctly heard that is confirmed, the remarks must be expunged.... (*Interruptions*). Whenever Mr. Bosu made references, those references were made to institutions like Government. Nobody has made references to individuals.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
The Chair itself has said that he had used those words against the Government. It has said that several times.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE:.... therefore, any references to any individual which are defamatory of this type, whether it be of the Opposition or of the Treasury Benches, should be judged in the proper way; we want uniform standards....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall give him uniform standards. He wants uniform standards. I shall give him uniform standards. Standard No. 1 is that every Member in this House, whether he is in the Opposition or on the Treasury Benches should use polite, courteous language to each other. This is uniform standard. Also Government is composed of individuals. When hon. Members say something here, the Ministers who are part of the Government are hurt naturally....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
This is most extraordinary....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Wonderful.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is very funny....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
Not at all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When they use very strong language....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
Much harsher words are used in the House of Commons against the Government.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is rather a mythical division that Government is something an entity; it is a sort of metaphysical conception. Government is not so. It is composed of individuals and that is evident in the House. Whenever strong language is used, they are hurt by it. It is also on record, as Shri Vayalar Ravi has mentioned just now, that somewhere Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu has said that the Prime Minister is the leader of the blackmarketeers.....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Leader of black money.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
Why did you not take objection to that?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: She is an individual. Therefore, if these words are on record, I rule that the word 'dirt' also is quite in order, and it is on the record....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
Now that you have dug up another thing with the help of the hon. Member, Shri Vayalar Ravi, may I say this? —If the Chair was remiss at that point of time not to pull up the hon. Member....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: My remark applies also to 'steal'....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
What you have done, Mr. Deputy-Speaker is most extraordinary, something to which we cannot agree, because you are trying to equate a remark against the Government with a remark against an individual member.

This is the precise point on which we want to register our protest. If you still stick to that stand, I will be constrained to say that in protest against this most extraordinary behaviour of the Chair, we will walk out of this House. There is no other way left to us to register our protest. In the House of Commons, much stronger words are used.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would only say that walking out in protest is in keeping with parliamentary procedure.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: When the Chair behaves in this extraordinary fashion, there is no other way to register our protest. This is the only way. Let it be on record that we registered our protest because the Chair does not conform to certain rules....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN
MISHRA:**

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:**

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE**

DR. KAILASH**

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing that Prof. Dandavate said has gone on record, and therefore, there is no need to say anything more on it. Let us go on. (*Interruptions*). Please sit down. There is no order in the House at the moment, and therefore, nothing is going on record. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu and some other Members then left the House

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR rose—

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing more on it please.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: You said that walk-out is unparliamentary.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I did not say that. I said that a walk-out as a protest was quite in keeping with parliamentary procedure.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: As one of those who are Independents, can I not have a say in this House?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Say what? Your name is associated with that of a great parliamentarian, an authority on parliamentary practice and procedure. At the moment, it is the Minister who is making a speech. What do you want to say? While he wants to make a speech, you want to make a speech?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Let me make a submission. My submission is only this; it is a point of order; that we shall never tolerate anything....

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Now, you are allowing him to make a speech.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has a point of order. I shall listen to you later on.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: You have said earlier that nothing will go on record. That is a different matter. The suggestion which came from the hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs was that a Member should behave himself in the House and that if there is a personal attack on anyone, whether it is the Prime Minister or anybody else, it should be expunged. I say that a personal attack on an Opposition Member should also be withdrawn. You have given a decision that we cannot use harsh words against the Government. (*Interruptions*) As a protest against this, we want to register our protest and walk out with due respect to the Chair and to the hon. Minister who, unfortunately, instead of apologising, was eulogising the whole thing.

**Not received.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

That is not going to serve us. We do not believe in throwing filth in this House, but I am afraid the Government will have to be criticised as harshly as possible, and on no circumstances are we going to be cowed down when decorum is challenged. I request the Minister to withdraw the whole thing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

SHRI S M BANERJEE: My point of order is this. I want a clear ruling from you whether the Opposition Member has a right to criticise the Government in a language which is harsh. He says no harsh language should be used. (Interruptions).

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have given a ruling. Even so, for your satisfaction I should like to repeat it. I am not saying that the Opposition cannot criticise the Government in strong terms, even harsh terms. I am only saying that Members who speak here should use courteous language so as not to provoke and create (Interruptions) Very strong, discourteous language is used on this side of the House. Although it is against Government, the Government is made of Ministers who are individuals. They are hurt by it; they are stung by it (Interruptions) If strong words are used against the Government and the Minister of State for Finance is stung by it, he gets up as a human being and he also uses similar strong language which is unfortunate. I do not want ...

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Mr Ganesh is nearer to me...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You raised a point of order and you do not want to listen? Now you want to bring in a mythical division between Government and individuals and all that sort of thing. I am concerned with what happens in this House. When strong,

discourteous language is used, it creates immediate results in this House, that is unfortunate. When a Member used the word 'steal' when he uses other words, when Mr Mishra used 'the rape of the Constitution', now 'rape' is a very dirty word.

SHRI S M BANERJEE: Rape of democracy, rape of the Constitution, these are well-known phrases.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Phrases may or may not be there. When you use the word and say 'Government rapes' "

SHRI S M BANERJEE: We have said that the Pakistani Government raped Bangla Desh.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: These words create their own effect and they bring some strong words from this side. I cannot sit in this Chair and say that words used on this side must be expunged and words used from that side must be allowed to be on record. I want to be fair. Mr. Mavalankar, have you a point of order? I do not want you also to imitate the way of professors. (Interruptions).

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I am sorry if I have given you a wrong impression.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: I neither apologise nor do I eulogise.

SHRI P G. MAVALANKAR: Quite rightly you said that a walk-out by any hon. Member of this House is not in tune with the procedural practices.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I did not say that. Did you hear me properly? You get up and say something which I never said. Walking out in protest is quite in keeping with parliamentary procedure. I thought that my English was very clear to everybody. I have trained myself to speak this

language as clearly as possible so that even a child in the school can follow me. I have been saying that walking out in protest is quite in keeping with our procedure. You keep on saying something else.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR I beg your pardon. Now, if walking out is also part of procedure, is not registering a protest in this House equally parliamentary?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not a point of order... (Interruptions).

Shri S. M. Banerjee and some hon. Member left the House

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: I never denied the right of the Opposition to criticise the Government strongly, even in harsh terms. But let us not hurl abuses at each other or trade in epithets and adjectives of abuse; let us not exchange there. Let us behave in a normal decent manner towards each other. I do not apologise for anything nor eulogise anybody

SHRI K. R. GANESH: The only point I have to answer is the reference made by Shri Banerjee to the Pay Commission. I have already replied many times in this House that the Pay Commission is likely to give its report by the end of this year. As for giving retrospective effect, etc. we had indicated that it is for the Pay Commission to decide and the views of the employees' association are before the Pay Commission. With these words I commend this motion for acceptance by the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is.

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sum from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the Financial year 1972-73, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We take up clause-by-clause consideration.

The question is.

"That clauses 2 and 3, the Schedule, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clauses 2 and 3, the Schedule, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI K. R. GANESH: I beg to move: "That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is a half-hour discussion at 5.30 but still there are 5 minutes. We will take up the Excess Grants.

17.26 hrs.†

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS (GENERAL), 1970-71

DEMAND No. 1—MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum of Rs 3,12,480/- be granted to the President to make good an excess on the grant in respect of 'Ministry of Defence' for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1971."

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.