

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a subject fit for an adjournment motion. As for the other notice, have I to tell you every day that matters under rule 377 are not taken up before the other formal business is over?

13.15 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

श्री राम रतन शर्मा (बादा) : अध्यक्ष जी, मैं राज्य प्राक प्रोसीजर एंड एडजस्ट प्राक विजनेस, लोक सभा के नियम 222 के अनुसार निम्न विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूँ—

क्रिमिनल प्रोसीजर कोड अमेंडमेंट बिल अभी लोक सभा क विचाराधीन है, किन्तु इलाहाबाद के एक प्रकाशक "हिन्द पब्लिशिंग हाउस" ने इस बिल को अधिनियम के रूप में प्रकाशित कर दिया है। इस से विचित रूप से संसद के विशेषाधिकार का हनन हुआ है। इस लिये इस प्रश्न को विशेषाधिकार समिति को सौंपने की कृपा की जाये।

श्रीमन्, उपरोक्त प्रकाशक ने बड़े ही कर्तव्यरही उसमें "एकट पासड" बाई राज्य सभा लिख दिया है, परन्तु उत की दिल के दाय एक्ट लिखा है और बड़े अक्षरों में लिखा है कि इसमें कम्पेरेटिव टेबिलिब दिये हैं और यह किताब पूरे उत्तर प्रदेश में, जिले-जिले बेची गई है। बेरा निवेदन है कि इस प्रश्न को विशेषाधिकार समिति को सौंपा जाय।

MR. SPEAKER: It is an interesting case that has come before this House, and I greatly appreciate that the hon. Member has put it before the House. I have seen this. The Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, is not yet out of the Parliament, nor has it received the President's assent. And these people publish it in the form of a regular enactment called "Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973" containing comparative tables relating to the sections of the old and the new codes.

They say that the improvement in this is that while there are 565 sections in the old Criminal Procedure Code, now there are only 485 in the newly enacted Criminal Procedure Code. "Newly enacted Criminal Procedure Code"—I have marked this. In a small bracket they write, "As passed by the Rajya Sabha". (Interruptions). Now, there are no two opinions on it. At least for me there are not two opinions. All these are published under the authority of parliament and still, when they are in a stage, when they are under consideration before this House, as coming from the Rajya Sabha, when someone publishes like this, I think it should go to the Privileges Committee.

But there is something technical about it. It is written here, "As passed by the Rajya Sabha." So, should it go to the Rajya Sabha Privileges Committee or our Privileges Committee? (Interruptions). I am sending it direct to them. With the concurrence of this House, I am sending it. They will examine it; they will issue notice to this gentleman and they will also take into consideration.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): This particular publication has come out after the Rajya Sabha has passed the Bill, and they have mentioned it also. But the question has been raised in this House, and I do not think you can rightly send it to the Rajya Sabha. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It is pending before our House.

SHRI B. P. MAURYA (Hapur): I do not think it is a question of privilege. All the newspapers have published it as passed by the Rajya Sabha. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I quite respect your views. There are two aspects of it. This is pending and is at present under consideration in our House. (Interruptions). Mr. Mahajan, you are very impatient. I know what you are going to say—keeping up the family tradition

The only thing is, it is misleading the House and the public by saying "newly enacted, 1973." They have mentioned the date of the enforcement also, over which this House has not given any finding. The Rajya Sabha matter is over now. We receive many suggestions from lawyers' associations, from the public organisations, and while the Bill is pending, by saying it as already enacted, it means they are creating an impression that it is already passed and they need not take any interest in it. Till the last stage, people have got the right to give you their suggestions, their opinions and advice and all that. If this goes out, then the people will be under the impression that it is already passed. So, I am sending it to the Privileges Committee.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): This is too small a matter.

MR. SPEAKER: For such a big person, this is too small a matter no doubt. Now, papers to be laid.

13.20 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

STATEMENT ON FLOOD SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI BALGOVIND VERMA): On behalf of Dr. K. L. Rao, I beg to lay on the Table a supplementary statement (Hindi and English versions) on the flood situation in the country. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5513/73].

NOTIFICATION ETC., UNDER A. P. PANCHAYAT SAMITIS AND ZILLA PARISHADS ACT, 1959 AND ACCOUNTS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONTROLLING & SUPERVISING EXPERIMENTS ON ANIMALS, BOMBAY FOR 1971-72

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (PROF. SHER SINGH): I beg to lay on the Table—

- (1) (i) A copy of Notification No. G.O. Ms. 562 published in

Andhra Pradesh Gazette dated the 26th April, 1973 making certain amendment to the Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Samitis and Zilla Parishads Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1960 under sub-section (2) of section 69 of the Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Samitis and Zilla Parishads Act, 1959 read with clause (c) (iii) of the Proclamation dated the 18th January, 1973 issued by the President in relation to the State of Andhra Pradesh, together with an explanatory note.

- (ii) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the above Notification.
- (iii) A statement explaining the reasons for not laying the Hindi version of the above Notification. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5514/73.]
- (2) A copy of the Certified Accounts (Hindi and English versions) of the Committee for the purpose of controlling and supervising Experiments on Animals, Bombay, for the year 1971-72 together with the Audit Report thereon, under sub-rule (4) of Rule 24 of the Committee for Controlling and Supervising Experiments on Animals (Administration) Rules, 1965. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5515/73]

STATEMENTS RE: CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO U.S.Q. No. 2318 DT. 7-8-73 AND REASONS FOR DELAY IN CORRECTING THE REPLY

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI BEDABRATA BARUA): I beg to lay on the Table two statements (Hindi and English versions), (i) correcting the reply given on the 7th August, 1973 to Unstarred Question No. 2318 by Shri Shashi Bhushan regarding setting up of hotel and fishing industry by foreign monopolist companies and