

number of Indian Missions abroad have not been inspected for the last three years;

(b) if so, the names of such Missions;

(c) whether there is any Mission which has not been inspected for more than three years and if so, the name of the Mission; and

(d) if so, the reasons therefor ?

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) Missions at the following forty Stations have been inspected from January 1964 to date :

Kinshasa (Congo), Lagos, Accra, Conakry, Rabat, Algeria, Tunis, Rome, Bangkok, Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur, Gangtok, London, Rio-de-Janeiro, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Basrah, New York, Oslo, Damascus, Baghdad, Kuwait, Warsaw, Belgrade, Vienna, Prague, Budapest, Paris, Stockholm, Hongkong, Tokyo, Kobe, Rangoon, Canberra, Sydney, Wellington, Suva, Manila, Singapore and Phnom Penh.

(c) Yes, Sir. Missions other than those indicated have not been inspected.

(d) It will be appreciated that all the Missions cannot be inspected at the same time. Arrangements are in hand for inspection of the remaining Missions in due course.

---

12. 15 hrs.

### CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

#### Resignation of Professor Thacker from Chairmanship of Industrial Licensing Policy Enquiry Committee

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA (Mandya) : Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Industrial Development and Company Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon :

"The resignation of Professor Thacker from the Chairmanship of the Industrial Licensing Policy Enquiry Committee.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED) : As the House will recall, I answered a Short Notice Question by Shri Chintamani Panigrahi on the 2nd April, 1968 enquiring as to whether Prof. Thacker had accepted the Directorship of the Bank of India and was attending its meetings and if so, Government's reaction thereto. Basing my reply to the Question entirely on the information given to me by Prof. Thacker himself on the 29th of March and the Secretary to the Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee on the 30th of March, I had then answered that Prof. Thacker was invited informally to a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Bank of India on the 28th of March, 1968 to let them know his decision on the offer made to him of the Directorship on the Board of the Bank. I had added, also on Prof. Thacker's information, that after telling the Board that he required three to four weeks to consider his decision, Prof. Thacker had come away from the meeting. The next day i.e. the 30th March, 1968 the Secretary of the Ministry of Industrial Development was informed by Shri K. L. Rathee, Secretary to the Inquiry Committee, on behalf of Prof. Thacker, both verbally and in writing that Prof. Thacker had decided not to accept the Bank's offer. The terms in which Shri Rathee communicated this were as follows :—

"Before leaving for New York this morning, Professor Thacker asked me to inform you that he has decided not to accept the Directorship of the Bank of India which was offered to him in a meeting held at Bombay on the 28th March, 1968".

In view of Prof. Thacker's decision not to accept the Bank's offer, I had indicated in my reply on the 2nd of April, 1968 that it was not proposed to take any further action in the matter. As you may remember, Sir, there was a demand by some Hon. Members that Prof. Thacker should not be allowed to continue as Chairman of the Committee and in your summing up, you were pleased to observe as follows :—

"Now as I see, there is no difference of opinion : All the Parties, including the Minister say that he went and

[Shri F. A. Ahmed]

attended the meeting; All of them say that this Committee must be above board; There is no difference of opinion on this in the Government or in the Opposition: With all this controversy and the unanimous opinion expressed by the Government, I am sure, Government will have to consider it. I do not think any difference of opinion is there on that”.

Sir, I have seen statements in the press to the effect that the Chairman of the Bank has denied that Prof. Thacker had declined the Bank's offer and similar statements have been attributed to Prof. Thacker also. All that I can say is that this is contrary to the Government's understanding since Government has a positive statement in writing from the Secretary of the Committee which I have cited above. It was naturally expected that following this, Prof. Thacker would also inform the Bank in similar terms about his decision. Whether he did so or not is more than I can say.

I should like to clear another misapprehension which seems to exist, namely, that Prof. Thacker's meeting with the Board of Directors of the Bank was with the knowledge of Government. It is, of course, correct that Government knew that Prof. Thacker was going to Bombay on the 28th of March, but Government was at no time aware that he was proposing to attend the meeting of the Board of Directors of the Bank of India. It is only on his return from Bombay that he informed me on the 29th of March that he had attended the meeting. I then expressed my surprise and unhappiness over his doing so, but he explained that he had gone there only to ask for time and that he left the meeting soon after communicating his views in the matter.

I trust that the above statement of facts will show conclusively that all that I had stated in reply to the Short Notice Question on the 2nd of April was based on facts and that there was no attempt whatsoever at concealment of any kind or to mislead the House.

On my return to Delhi from tour on the evening of the 21st April, 1968, by which date Prof. Thacker had also returned from abroad, I received a letter from him of the same date in which he indicated that

in the circumstances as they had developed, he would like to resign from the Chairmanship of the Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee. I accepted his resignation the very next day. It is in my view regrettable, however, that Prof. Thacker's letter was allowed to receive considerable publicity even before I could reply to him.

I would like to make it clear that Prof. Thacker seems to have had some misunderstanding of my views as expressed in my earlier discussion with him on the 20th of March. I am at a loss to understand how this happened, but even if there was any such misconception, I am sure it could not have lasted for long. So far as I am concerned, from the very beginning I had made it clear to Prof. Thacker that the Chairmanship of the Committee and the Directorship of the Bank are not consistent with each other, having regard to the proprieties involved in the matter. I had stressed that it was most important that the stature and the status of the Committee should not be allowed to suffer in any manner. These views were reiterated by me on the 27th of March when Prof. Thacker met me before he left for Bombay and again on the 29th of March on the eve of his departure for New York. If it had been a fact that I had agreed to Prof. Thacker continuing as Chairman of the Committee even after becoming a Director of the Bank, surely there would have been some communication by the Government to him or to the Committee to that effect. In fact there was no such communication from Government. On the contrary, the fact that Prof. Thacker declined the offer of the Bank on the 30th March, 1968 is ample testimony, if indeed such testimony is needed, that he made up his mind following his meetings with me on 27th and 29th of March, when I had reiterated in no uncertain terms what my reactions were to his continuing as Chairman if he accepted the Directorship of the Bank. It is obvious that it was these views which hastened his decision, in spite of the fact :

- (a) that he had asked for three to four weeks' time from the Bank to make up his mind, and
- (b) that one of his colleagues, Shri Kumaramangalam, had protested

and the matter was to be further discussed on April 26th, when the Committee was scheduled to meet after Prof. Thacker's return from abroad. Meanwhile Dr. Paranjape also joined in the protest of Shri Kumaramangalam.

It has also been said that Prof. Thacker took the prior permission of the Government to consider the offer of the Bank of India. So far as I am concerned, the question of prior permission did not actually arise, as it seems that the offer had been under his consideration for some time for personal reasons. It is not known to Government even now as to when Prof. Thacker received the offer of the Bank of India in the first instance and how long he had been in touch with the Bank on the subject. The fact of the offer was brought to Government's notice for the first time only about the middle of March last. The statement, therefore, that the offer was considered with the prior permission of the Government is untenable. I would like to add here that while acceptance or non-acceptance of the offer was a matter wholly for Professor Thacker to decide, the Government was concerned only with his continuance as the Chairman of the Inquiry Committee, if he were to accept such an offer.

In the light of the above, I would repeat to the Honourable House that I stand by all that I have said in answer to the Short Notice Question put to me on the 2nd of April, 1968. In the interest of the dignity, impartiality and rectitude with which a Committee of this stature should work, I have already intimated to Professor Thacker that Government have accepted his resignation.

I observe that some press reports mention that Shri Rathee, Secretary of the Committee, has also resigned. Although this has not been said in so many words, there seems to be an implied suggestion of a link between the two resignations. I should like to make it clear to the House that Shri Rathee informed the Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee as early as the 22nd March, 1968 that he was retiring because he had offered himself a candidate for election for a seat in the Rajya Sabha from Haryana. His retirement, therefore, has absolutely no

connection with Prof. Thacker's resignation.

I would also like to add that since I am very anxious that the work of the Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee should not be delayed, I am hoping to be able to announce the appointment of the new Chairman of the Committee very shortly.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : No please. Mr. S. M. Krishna.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the light of the statement the hon. Minister has made, if we take up questions now, what will happen to the privilege motion ?

SHRI D. N. PATODIA (Jalore) : It is the privilege motion which should be taken now.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम लोगों का प्रिविलेज का क्वेश्चन मान लीजिये ।

MR. SPEAKER : No please. Mr. S. M. Krishna, you please ask your question.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA : One thing stands out very clear in this ugly episode that the misapprehensions expressed on the floor of this House by the hon. Members on 2nd April have been more than confirmed by the long statement which the hon. Minister has made to-day. He is trying by the sheer—it is a very long statement—by the sheer length of his statement to create a smokescreen in order to hide certain facts. (*Interruptions*). Sir, I am not holding any brief for Prof. Thacker, but I hold a brief for truth and the facts that this House is entitled to. I am very happy that Prof. Thacker has resigned and I congratulate the Minister for the alacrity with which he has accepted the resignation.

Coming to the statement. I quote what Prof. Thacker had to say on this episode, and they are very relevant. Prof. Thacker who happens to be a very distinguished countryman of ours, was a member of the Planning Commission:

**SHRI NAMBIAR** (Tiruchirappalli) :  
He was.

**SHRI S. M. KRISHNA** : And it is this Government which appointed him and it is this Minister who appointed him to preside over a very important Committee like the one which was appointed.

**SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH** (Pali) : And they sent him to New York only last week.

**SHRI S. M. KRISHNA** : I quote what he has to say :

"The whole complexion of the discussion would have perhaps changed if one important fact that I had taken prior permission of the Government to consider the offer of Directorship had been disclosed to the House."

If the hon. Minister had only disclosed this fact to the House, the allegations levelled against Prof. Thacker would not have come.

The second point is that after getting the clearance from the Minister, Prof. Thacker took pains to consult his other two colleagues on the Committee. I again quote from Prof. Thacker's letter :

"After obtaining your permission, I also discussed the matter with my other two colleagues, Mr. Mohan Kumaramangalam and Dr. Paranjape and in view of the position taken by them I had offered to resign from the Chairmanship of the Committee."

One thing stands out very clear that after Prof. Thacker had consulted his other two colleagues, also there is a letter which the Secretary of the Committee has addressed to the Secretary of the Department with which Mr. Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed is connected. I would like that letter to be placed on the Table of the House. I also demand that a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament representing all shades of opinion here be appointed.

**MR. SPEAKER** : You can only seek clarification. Come to your question now.

**AN HON. MEMBER** : That is the question, Sir.

**SHRI NAMBIAR** : The hon. Minister should either resign or appoint a Committee.

**SHRI S. KUNDU** *rose—*

**MR. SPEAKER** : Mr. Kundu you have no right to ask questions. This is a call attention motion. The question of Mr. Krishna will be answered.

**SHRI F. A. AHMED** : I am very glad that the hon. Member is giving me an opportunity to repeat once again what I said. (*Interruptions*).

**श्री मधु लिमये** (मं.गेर) : हम आपका भी इस्तीफा चाहते हैं। आप नहीं जा रहे हैं क्या ? डेकर साहब तो गये, आप कब जा रहे हैं, यह हम जानना चाहते हैं।

**श्री रवि राय** : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे प्रिविलेज क्वेश्चन के बारे में भी विचार कीजिये।

**श्री मधु लिमये** : आप इस्तीफा दे दीजिये। अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे नियमों में पुनरुक्ति की, रिपिटिशन की इजाजत नहीं है।

**SHRI F. A. AHMED** : If the word repeat is not liked by the hon. Member I would substitute it by saying, to recuperate what I stated on the 2nd of April...

**AN HON. MEMBER** : Is it recuperating or recapitulating ?

**SHRI HEM BARUA** (Mangaldai) : English language should not be assassinated in this way, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER** : Order, order.

**SHRI HEM BARUA** : Why do you allow the English language to be assassinated like this on the Floor of the House ?

**MR. SPEAKER** : Shri Panigrahi.

**SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI**  
*rose—*

**SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK** (South Delhi) : Either he should deny or accept what Professor Thacker has said. He should say whether it is right or wrong. We should know whether he will deny it or not. (*Interruption*)

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS** *rose—*

MR. SPEAKER : I will ask all of you to sit down.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur) : Let him resign and also agree for an Inquiry.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : I am prepared to answer every question but if the hon. Members are not in a mood to listen I am not going to oblige if they go on shouting without listening to it. Now, what I wanted to say was this. Earlier the question was raised whether Professor Thacker had accepted the directorship and I replied that he had not accepted the directorship. The second question was...

SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur) : Consent was given by you.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : Let me have my say. Let me say what I have to say in my own way. The second question was whether he has taken our permission to accept this directorship and I said, no. He has not taken our permission and I stand by every word of what I said on that day.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : On a point of order, Sir. A specific question was asked. The Minister did not reply to that question. (Interruption).

MR. SPEAKER : I am on my legs now. Between the Minister and Prof. Thacker somebody has to decide. Now let us hear him.

श्री मधु लिमये : जैसे ठेकर साहब का इस्तीफा करवाया उसी तरह से मन्त्री महोदय का भी इस्तीफा करवा दिजिये ... (ब्यवधान)...

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : If all of you get up, what can I say ? I am not going to allow all of you. If anybody is not satisfied he can say he is not satisfied. If all of you start shouting God alone knows where it will all lead us. If Shri Krishna is satisfied.....

SHRI NATH PAI : He is not satisfied. He is completely dissatisfied.

SHRI NAMBIAR *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : He does not need your help. Neither Shri Krishna nor the Minister needs your help.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : If you remember, Sir, I had also stated on that day that if he accepted the directorship, it would be impossible for him to continue as Chairman of this committee.

The question which has been raised by my hon. friend is that Professor Thacker had permission from me. Professor Thacker had three meetings with me—one on the 20th March, another on the 27th March and the last meeting that he had with me was on the 29th March just before he left for America. If Professor Thacker had my approval to accept the directorship, what was the necessity for him to come and see me so often ; (Shri Hem Barua : That is a lame excuse.) what was the necessity for him to go and tell the directors of the Bank that he wanted three or four weeks' time to decide; (Interruption) what was the necessity for him to ask the Secretary to send a letter, soon after he had seen me, that he declined the offer made by the Bank ? Therefore, it indicated that whatever misunderstanding he had, I made it absolutely clear to him that his remaining the Chairman as well as accepting the directorship of the Bank would be inconsistent and would not be in accordance with dignity and he decided not to accept the Bank offer and sent a letter from the Secretary..... (Interruption)

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar) : I am grateful to you and to the House for the way in which the House has asserted itself on such a vital matter. Today the whole country also remains grateful to this House and to the Speaker. In view of this unanimous decision, Professor Thacker has gone.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : What unanimous decision ?

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : It is very good. But in the intervening period some new facts have come to light and some new characters have appeared on the scene of this great episode of Professor Thacker which should be brought to your notice and to the notice of the House for consideration so that the House considers

[Shri Chintamani Panigrahi]

it dispassionately and the main issue may not be sidetracked. Therefore I bring to your kind notice the following new facts.

MR. SPEAKER : At this stage only for a clarification you can ask the Minister. If you want to bring anything to my notice, you can do so in my Chamber.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : By "you", I mean, "the House through you".

I would just like to know from the hon. Minister as to who first sponsored the idea to Professor Thacker that he should accept the directorship of the Bank of India. By whom was this idea conceived first? Gradually, as the drama is unfolded, you will come to know that he has acted completely as an agent of the big monopoly houses of this country.... (Interruption)

I would like to know whether on the 29th February, when a great birthday was observed in Delhi—this birthday comes every four years; I will not mention names—some ex-minister, who acted as the go-between, first sponsored this idea that Professor Thacker should accept the directorship of this Bank. Is this correct?

AN HON. MEMBER : This is diversion.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE : Diversionary tactics.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order.

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI : On the 16th March Professor Thacker wanted to meet the Minister. On the 17th he met the Minister. On the 19th some letters were written by Professor Thacker to the Minister. On the 20th the Secretary, Shri Rathee, also wrote a letter. On the 21st March again Professor Thacker saw the Minister. On the 22nd there was the Committee meeting. On the 23rd other members objected saying that if Professor Thacker continued as a director of the Bank, he could not continue as Chairman of the Committee.

Then, on 25th, he again met the Secretary and on 27th, he met the Minister.

I would like the Minister to tell the House what he was discussing during all these meetings, whether he was discussing the Committee business or whatever it is because he was all along under a kind of emotional conflict whether to continue as the Chairman as that carried emoluments of Rs. 2,200 with all facilities of a Minister of State and then the Directorship of the Bank... (Interruption). I hope the Minister will clarify all these points. Lastly, I would like the Minister to let us know whether, besides a house in Bangalore, he has a good flat in the Mafatal building in Bombay. That is the latest information I got yesterday. In view of his link, his association, with the big capitalist houses, I would like to know whether the Minister would like to have a committee to investigate into the affairs of Mr. Thacker.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : On a point of order, Sir. This is absolutely irrelevant. This is not under discussion. Only the Minister's statement is under discussion. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Let us hear the Minister.

SHRI F. A. AHMED : So far as the first question is concerned, I am not aware at whose instance this offer was made to Prof. Thacker. As I have already pointed out in my statement, I am also not aware of the point of time when the offer was made. The first letter that I had from him was sometime in middle of March asking for an opportunity and he met me on the 26th March. Before that he had seen my Secretary. Only then, I knew that the offer was made. At the very first meeting, when he told me about his financial difficulty and that after his retirement, he will have nothing to look upon, and it was for this reason he was considering the proposal...

श्री मधु लिमये : हाँ, इस तरीके से सरकार बेची जा रही है।

SHRI F. A. AHMED : .. my reply to him was that it was entirely his personal

matter and I was not the person to advise so far as his personal matter is concerned and that, after he had taken a decision, it will be for me to decide whether he should remain the Chairman of this Committee. Then he said, on that day, that he wanted to discuss with his colleagues. I said, "You let me know your decision and, once you have taken your decision, I will decide it."

**SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH (Parbhani)** : Will the hon. Minister clear once and for all whether this distinguished scientist came to be appointed as the Chairman of this important Committee as an employment benefit on humanitarian grounds and, if so, whether the Secretary of this Committee, Mr. Rathee, conveyed on telephone to the Secretary of the Ministry and also in writing that Prof. Thacker's financial position was precarious, that he was selling carpets, not carpets of jute, of Persian make worth lakhs and millions of rupees... (*Interruptions*).

**MR. SPEAKER** : The whole thing is going out of gear now.

**SHRI SHIVAJIRAO S. DESHMUKH** : May I know whether the Secretary of his Ministry has received a communication from the Secretary of this Committee saying that Prof. Thacker is in financial difficulty and, because of that, he is already thinking of accepting employment in some Bank? (*Interruptions*).

**MR. SPEAKER** : Both the sides are doing this... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Sondhi... Not here.

Mr. Sreedharan...

**DR. SUSHILA NAYAR (Jhansi)** : I rise on a point of order.

**MR. SPEAKER** : I have called Mr. Sreedharan. Let him have his privilege. His name is there. Afterwards, I will call her.

**DR. SUSHILA NAYAR** : This point of order is relevant to what this hon. Member has said just now.

**MR. SPEAKER** : She can raise her point of order later. I will have to answer that and not the Minister. I have called Mr. Sreedharan. Let him ask his question.

**SHRI A. SREEDHARAN (Badagara)** : When robbers fall out, the truth emerges. Today the skeleton is out of the cupboard and it stinks on our nostrils. I do not think that this is something concerning merely Mr. Thacker or merely the Minister. This is a conspiracy hatched by the Industrial Development Ministry in collaboration with the big business houses and also with the connivance of the Chairman of the Industrial Licensing Policy Inquiry Committee, in which the Secretary of the Ministry of Industrial Development, Mr. Wanchoo, has acted as the midwife of this conspiracy...

**MR. SPEAKER** : He will now come to the question.

**SHRI A. SREEDHARAN** : The Minister, in his reply to the Short Notice Question has given a very good hit to Prof. Thacker. He has stated :

"I do not, for a moment, believe that a person..."

He refers to Prof. Thacker.

"...that a person of his stature and status would fall a prey to such temptations, and unless, and until there is a positive evidence before us that he has done something, no action can be taken..."

I have quoted the Minister. A conduct certificate has been given by him to Prof. Thacker. He has also denied the question of conducting an inquiry. When he has denied it, I would like to ask a simple and a straight question, and I want a straight answer. Mr. Thacker has stated that he got the Minister's clearance before he went to the meeting of the Board of Directors of the Bank. This has come out in the newspapers. It is a defamatory statement in view of the Minister's statement. Will the Minister, therefore, go out, seek the protection of court and file a defamation suit against Mr. Thacker? Either Mr. Thacker is an abject liar or the Minister is a colossal hoax.

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** I have already stated that he had no clearance from me, so far as the acceptance of the Directorship is concerned. It was entirely a matter for him to decide and I told him... (*Interruptions*).

**SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peermade):** To attend the Board meeting.

**SHRI F. A. AHMED :** First of all, so far as the Directorship is concerned, I told him that it was entirely his personal matter and after he had taken a decision, it would be for me to decide whether he could continue as the Chairman of the Committee or not.

About the second question, whether he had clearance to attend the meeting of the Board, I did not know that he was going there to attend the meeting of the Board... (*Interruption*).

**MR. SPEAKER :** What is Dr. Sushila Nayar's point of order ?

**DR. SUSHILA NAYAR :** My point is this. We have repeatedly stated in this House that officers who cannot protect themselves... (*Interruption*). I wish to say that to the best of my knowledge and the knowledge of many other people in this House, Prof. Thacker is an honest man, is a good man... (*Interruptions*).

**MR. SPEAKER :** Is that the point of order ?

**DR. SUSHILA Nayar :** It is absolutely necessary that this matter be thoroughly investigated. It is not fair to treat an eminent officer who cannot defend himself on the floor of this House in this manner.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह क्या प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है ?

**SHRI KANAWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) :** Let there be a CBI inquiry into this episode. (*Interruptions*)

श्री शशि नूषण काजयेमी (खारगोन) : इस की इनक्वायरी होनी चाहिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : इन्क्वायरी की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। मिनिस्टर साहब इस्तीफा दें।

**MR. SPEAKER :** Order, order. If so many Members are going to stand and speak simultaneously in this manner, then how can we conduct business in the House ? If all of them would sit down, I can call one of them, and we can conduct our business. How could we conduct business if so many Members start speaking simultaneously ?

**SHRI J. B. KRIPALANI (Guna) :** I have only to say this. When such a big chunk of the House is excited over this matter, why should the Minister say that he has objection to an inquiry ? If everything is right and above board, there should be no objection to an inquiry.

**MR. SPEAKER :** After all, on that day they were excited against so-and-so, against the chairman of the inquiry committee attending some meeting or something of that sort. Today they are excited over something else.

**AN HON. MEMBER :** Not something else, but the same thing.

**SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH :** Because the hon. Minister is telling a lie...

**MR. SPEAKER :** I have a right to express my opinion. He cannot contradict even my opinion. I have a right to say what I want. I cannot change my views to suit his whims. One section of the House says one thing, and another section of the House says something else. Now, I am here to express my view. My point is this. Shall we go on to the other business, or shall I adjourn the House now ?

The hon. Minister would consider whether he should accept some inquiry or not. That is a different matter. If he can do it, I have no objection.

My point is about something else which I wanted to tell you...

**SHRI UMANATH (Pudukkottai) :** We have given a privilege motion.

**MR. SPEAKER :** The privilege motion cannot be decided until I admit it here and place it before the House. It is only then that it will be decided. By their shouting, hon. Members cannot have it decided now. There are a large number of privilege motions...

श्री मधु तिमये : इस पर आप बहस की अनुमति दीजिये ।

MR. SPEAKER : I said the other day that after hearing the hon. Minister's answer, I shall decide whether the privilege motion would be placed before the House here. Naturally, now that I have heard him, I shall take a decision. Let hon. Members leave it at that.

Now, I want to inform the House that one of our colleagues Shri Kameshwar Singh has been arrested...

SHRI RANGA : It is not my intention to embarrass you or the House. But I can assure you that so far as we are concerned, we are not excited over this matter. At the same time, we find in the light of the discussion that we have had so far that there are so many points which are being disputed, points of facts which are being disputed on either side, and they cannot be decided in the open House in this manner. That was the reason why even earlier so many of us had given...

MR. SPEAKER : I have not closed it yet. I have not rejected it. The privilege motion is there.

SHRI RANGA : The privilege motion was there before you...

MR. SPEAKER : Why does he want to raise it now ?

SHRI RANGA : It is not a question of your having to consider it.

MR. SPEAKER : If I had rejected it then I could have understood the hon. Member's referring to it.

SHRI RANGA : We would like to submit that this matter should be kept alive and the privilege motion should be considered by you, and we would like you to give us permission to raise it here at the earliest so that the House would be able to express its view either in favour of or against the privilege motion.

MR. SPEAKER : I may tell him that it is kept pending. I shall consider.

SHRI RANGA : I would like to add one thing more...

MR. SPEAKER : Why should he add more now? Let him take his chance tomorrow.

13 hrs.

SHRI RANGA : We do not want the Minister's head at the altar, nor do we want to sit in judgment over Prof. Thacker. But we are only interested in the proper proprieties which should be observed by Ministers as well as their officers.

This is a question of the manner in which the House has got to deal with these Ministers also in their dealings with the House as well as with these officers. In regard to this particular matter, I wanted it to be clearly understood by all sections of the House that we do not want to punish anybody merely for its own sake ; nor do we want to censure Government merely because one particular point has come in this way. We want that the House should give its best possible Judgment in regard to this matter in an impartial, non-partisan manner. That is why we want that this should go to the Privileges Committee and the House should not take a decision on it at this stage.

#### ARREST OF MEMBER (SHRI KAMESHWAR SINGH)

MR. SPEAKER : When a member of the House has been arrested and I have receive intimation of it, I have to bring it to the notice of the House.

This is the telegram I have received, dated 22nd April 1968, from the Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Bhuj, at Khavda, Kutch :

"Shri Kameshwar Singh, Member, Lok Sabha, was arrested for offence under sections 143, 145 and 188, Indian Penal Code and detained at Bhuj Jail".

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : इसके बारे में मेरा एक निवेदन है । उस दिन आपके पास एक तार भेजा था...

MR. SPEAKER : I brought it to the notice of the House yesterday,