

statement if every leader of every party is allowed to make speeches, it may be difficult. I do not mind it if you change the rules. But on this issue, let us have a discussion, not today, because we have to finish the Railway Budget—I forgot about it—even if we have sit half an hour or one hour late. Tomorrow it has got to go to the Rajya Sabha. We are far behind the budget demands. The House must remember that. All will have to be guillotined on the 21st of July. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves whether we can waste the time of the House. Railway Budget must be finished today and it should go to the Rajya Sabha. If necessary, I will fix up some time for a discussion. Technically, somebody must give a notice.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): There is a notice already.

Mr. Speaker: So, we shall now adjourn for lunch.

13.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Fourteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

RE. POINT OF PERSONAL EXPLANATION

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप से मेरी एक विनती है। दो दिन पहले जब आप कुर्सी पर बैठे हुए थे तब आप ने बनर्जी साहब के बारे में कुछ कहा था कि उन्होंने गलत झूजामात लमाये हैं। आपने यह भी कहा था कि :

“Either Mr. Banerjee will have to produce evidence to substantiate these allegations or...he will have to apologize to the House.”

यह आपका निर्णय है। उस दिन श्री बनर्जी नहीं थे। वह आज आये हैं। आप उनको 896 (A1) LSD—7.

दो मिनट का मौका दीजिये क्योंकि वह गैरहाजिर थे जब यह बात कही गई थी। आप उनको दो मिनट के लिये सुन लीजिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I remember I have made that observation. On the same matter, a point of privilege was to be raised today, and the Speaker has said he would look into it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): This has nothing to do with the privilege motion. Kindly hear me for a minute; just two minutes.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या उनकी अनुपस्थिति में कोई बात यहां हो सकती है उनके बारे में ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If it is only for two minutes, I am prepared to listen. We have to finish the railway demands for grants today.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am not taking more time.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं विशेषाधिकार के प्रश्न पर नहीं कह रहा हूँ। मैं श्री बनर्जी के बारे में कह रहा हूँ। वह जो कुछ कह रहे हैं उसको सुन लीजिये। मान लीजिये कि विशेषाधिकार प्रस्ताव आता ही नहीं है तब उनको तो कोई मौका नहीं मिलेगा और उनके बारे में सदन में और सदन के बाहर एक तरह की गलतफहमी रहेगी। आप उनको सिर्फ दो मिनट दीजिये। वह व्यक्तिगत स्पष्टीकरण देना चाहते हैं, वह दो मिनट से ज्यादा समय नहीं लेंगे। इसके लिये नियम है। (व्यवधान) यह लोग समय बरबाद कर रहे हैं। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप का व्यक्तिगत स्पष्टीकरण करने देने का अधिकार है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I can allow, but the question is the time factor.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have given notice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us proceed with the railway budget. I will permit him later.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): He cannot be allowed to raise it just now. We are now on the Demands for Grants (Railways).

Shri Thirumala Rao (Kakinada): Before you allow him, I want to make a submission.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप सबमिशन क्यों करते हैं। आप सुनिये। सबमिशन नहीं हो सकता है।

Shri Thirumala Rao: You are not the man to decide it. I will speak through the Deputy-Speaker.

श्री मधु लिमये : अगर माननीय सदस्य नहीं बैठेंगे, तो मेरा प्वाइंट आफ़ आर्डर है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप को नियम 357 के मातहत अनुमति देने का अधिकार है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am reading the same rule No. 357:

"A Member may, with the permission of the Speaker, make a personal explanation although there is no question before the House, but in this case no debatable matter may be brought forward and no debate shall arise."

I am not saying he has no right to give a personal explanation. The question is, he should write to me what he wants to say, so that I can see if there is anything debatable in it.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह कोई डिबेटेबल प्वाइंट नहीं उठा रहे हैं। वह तो केवल एक स्पष्टीकरण कर रहे हैं। वह कोई विवाद उठायेंगे ही नहीं।

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I object to this kind of statement being made, because in the morning the Speaker has said that if there is any point, it should be discussed with him in his chamber. After the Home Minister's statement, there is nothing else on the agenda and you have to pass on to the railway budget,

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is not about the privilege motion. He just wants to say one sentence.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: What kind of statement does he want to make? (Interruptions).

श्री मधु लिमये : वह स्पष्टीकरण कर रहे हैं, वह कोई विवाद नहीं खड़ा कर रहे हैं। मंत्री महोदय क्यों भ्रङ्गा डाल रहे हैं ?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Something was said in my absence. I must get an opportunity.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will give you an opportunity. But whatever you want to say, you send me in writing and I will read it out. There would not be any debate.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have written to the Speaker yesterday. Kindly give me one minute. When I was sick and away, some charges were levelled against me. (Interruptions).

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: After the Home Minister's statement, you must pass on to the railway budget.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा व्यवस्था सम्बन्धी प्रश्न है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आप ने अनुमति दी है। यह लोग संख्या बल पर आप को डरा घमका रहे हैं। जहां पहले दो तीन मिनट लगने वाले थे वहां अब दस मिनट लगा रहे हैं।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Under rule 357, you are perfectly entitled to give a personal explanation, I agree. Just now you said that you had discussed certain matters with the Speaker.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You have said in your wisdom:

"If there is a *prima facie* evidence with him, we will deal with it and if he has not, he will have to apologise to the House."

I do not apologise to the House.

I say that many Cabinet Members are Birla's agents.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Sir, how can you allow anything of this type at this moment?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He does not want to apologise, that is all.

श्री मधु लिमये : प्राप ने कहा था कि स्पीकर को लिखना चाहिये । उन्होंने लिखा है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Already he has made his statement. Let us proceed with the Railway Demands.

Shri K. K. Nayar (Bahraich): Sir, I rise to a point of order. At the outset, when the request was made, you were pleased to say that Shri Banerjee would be given a chance but he should not take more than two minutes. He agreed to confine his remarks to the limits imposed by you. Thereafter the relevant rule was read out and under that rule a Member is allowed a chance of personal explanation in your discretion. There is nothing in it about his giving it in writing. Hon. Members on the other side of the House certainly did not like Shri Banerjee to be allowed to make an explanation and they have raised this commotion. I respectfully submit that if you accept this attempt at eroding your privileges and circumventing your decision we shall not be able to proceed with any business in this House. It is not that the practice is new or unknown to us.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: In between Shri Banerjee said that he had a talk with the Speaker regarding this matter. If he had already discussed it with the Speaker, then there was no question of my giving him a chance now.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I had no talk; I had written to the Speaker. (*Interruptions*). Sir, kindly hear me for a minute.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have already made your statement.

Shri K. K. Nayar: Sir, in the very beginning itself you had taken a stand and given your decision.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, you cannot say whatever you like in my absence. You have given a ruling. You want me to apologise. Apologise to whom? To the agents of Birlas?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A certain observation was made in his absence. On that he has said that that observation is not correct. That is enough. So far as other things are concerned he will have to write according to the Rules.

Shri K. K. Nayar: You agreed to allow him two minutes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He is flourishing a big document.

Shri K. K. Nayar: If he exceeds two minutes you can always pull him up.

Shri M. Y. Saleem (Nalgonda): Sir, I rise to a point of order. Without going into the controversy whether Rule 357 is applicable or not—I am not inviting your attention to that—it is said in the rule that "a Member may with the permission of the Speaker . . .". Have you given your permission?

Some hon. Members: Yes, yes.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Initially I said that he is perfectly within his rights to make an explanation.

Shri M. Y. Saleem: That was the interpretation of the rule given by you. You have not yet given permission to him. You have . . . (*Interruptions*). Sir, at least I must be allowed to say what I want to say. Everybody is entitled to speak in this House.

श्री मधु लिमये : प्राप उपाध्यक्ष महोदय को नोटीस करना चाहते हैं ।

Shri M. Y. Saleem: I am entitled to say what I have to say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have followed your point.

Shri M. Y. Saleem: Sir, you are the best judge of your ruling. If you have permitted him, the question of any further permission does not arise.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji (Howrah): Sir, I rise to a point of order. Rule 357 says:

"A Member may, with the permission of the Speaker, make a personal explanation although there is no question before the House, but in this case no debatable matter may be brought forward, and no debate shall arise."

Therefore, it will have to be seen by the Chair whether the hon. Member is introducing any debatable matter.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Sir, you allowed him two minutes. Because Dr. Ram Subhag Singh did not agree to that we have already spent ten minutes. We are also sitting here. We are seeing what is happening.... (Interruptions).

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The hon. Member cannot accuse me like this. Who are you... (Interruptions).

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Who are you? Who are you to question our arguing with the Speaker? Your police force is outside, not inside Parliament House.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I am not going to be guided by you.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Please resume your seat.

Shri Umanath: Let him sit down first. (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Umanath, I would like to say one thing. When Shri Gopalan raised his voice of protest, he did it with decorum. So, I did not say anything. Then, where was the necessity for you to shout?

Shri Umanath: Immediately, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh stood up and said . . .

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: No, I did not.

Shri Umanath: I am not talking to you. I am addressing the Deputy-Speaker. Sir, you asked me where was the necessity for me to butt in. A valid and correct question. The moment this question arose, he asked how such a discussion can be allowed.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Yes, I did it.

Shri Umanath: Who are you to do that? . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let every hon. Member resume his seat. Let them say whatever they want when I give them permission. We must behave with some dignity. When we function here, we raise points regarding the privilege, dignity and decorum of the House. So, if we behave like this when outsiders are watching us, what impression will they have about us?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: The Minister must also be held responsible for this. I charge him. If only he had acted in a different way, it would have been over long ago.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have never accused you, Shri Gopalan.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: We are sitting here from morning to evening. Shri Banerjee wanted only two minutes. Now, we have already spent 15 minutes. If only the Minister had acceded to the request for two minutes this controversy would not have arisen.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Why should I make that gesture?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: He is the Minister in charge of Parliamentary Affairs.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: I did plead for it on the last occasion, but not today. Do you want to make Parliament a mockery?

Shri Umanath: You have done it. You have reduced it to pieces . . . (Interruptions). You have made it a laughing stock . . . (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The point is this. When a request for an explanation was made, I thought that it might get into a discussion. Therefore, I said that I will give only two minutes for a personal clarification, where no debatable matter should be brought in. I have already made it clear. To this suggestion, members on this side pointed out that he might bring in debatable matter. That was the only caution they gave. They never objected to the Chair giving permission to the Member to make his explanation. That is wrong.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: The Speaker advised both Shri Vajpayee and Shri Banerjee in the morning that they should discuss the matter with him. After that, he asked the Home Minister to make his statement. When the statement of the Home Minister is over, we should normally pass on to the Railway Budget, and not take up any other item. Now, there is a deviation. That deviation must be ended.. (Interruptions).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please listen. What happened was this. When Shri Vajpayee gave notice of a privilege motion, Shri Banerjee also got up in that connection. The Speaker ruled that he will discuss the matter with him. The present clarification or explanation has nothing to do with the privilege motion. On that day some allegations were made and I said that if he makes them and he could not substantiate them, he will have to apologise to the House. It is only on that matter he is going to make a personal explanation, without bringing in any debatable matter. He should take only two minutes.

Shri Krishna Kumar Chatterji: Sir, you have not heard my point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry. Let us hear him.

श्री स० धी० बनर्जी : 20 तारीख को जब मैं इस हाउस में नहीं था और बीमारी के

कारण घा नहीं सका तो मुझे मालूम हुआ कि जब सत्य नारायण जी और पन्त जी के बारे में बहस छिड़ी थी, भर्जुन भरोड़ा जी ने जो आरोप लगाये थे, उनको ले कर तब घाप ने कहा था :

“Either Mr. Banerjee will have to produce evidence to substantiate those allegations, show that evidence to the Chair or the Committee of Privileges, and in that case, if there is a *prima facie* evidence with him, we will deal with it, and if he has not, he will have to apologise to the House.”

भगर मैं हाउस में रहता, तो मैं घाप को और इस सदन को जरूर यह कहता कि मैंने 30 मई को जो कुछ जो आरोप की शकल में कहा था, . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री मधु लिषये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, ये माननीय सदस्य कदम कदम पर रकाबट डाल रहे हैं। घाप इनको मना कीजिये।

श्री स० भं० बनर्जी : जो आरोप मैंने लगाये थे या आरोपों की शकल में जो कुछ श्री भर्जुन भरोड़ा ने कहा था, आज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस के बारे में कोई माफ़ी मांगने की बात नहीं है। माफ़ी वे लोग मांगें, जो बिड़ला से पैसे लेते रहे हैं और लेते रहेंगे। कोई कमीशन या कमेटी इन आरोपों की जांच कर सकती है। (व्यवधान) मैं घाप से निवेदन करूंगा कि घाप ऐसे निर्णय देने से पहले यह सोच लें कि जितनी इज्जत उधर है, उतनी इज्जत हमारी भी है। जहाँ तक माफ़ी मांगने का ताल्लुक है, माफ़ी तो शायद सब लोगों को मांगनी पड़ती है। घाप को भी मांगनी पड़ी थी। * * (व्यवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This is not fair. I will not allow it . . . (Interruption).

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : इन बातों की एन्वयरी कराई जाये ।

Shri K. N. Tiwary (Bettiah): On a point of order, Sir.

Shri Vikram Chand Mahajan (Chamba): That must be expunged.

श्री मधु लिमये : एकसपज करने का क्या प्रश्न है ? एकसपज क्यों किया जाये ? अगर माननीय सदस्यों में हिम्मत है, तो इनको प्रिविलेजिज कमेटी के सामने ले जायें ।

श्री क० ना० तिवारी : भ्रान ए पायंट ब्राफ़ ब्रांडर, सर। माननीय सदस्य, श्री बनर्जी, की बराबर यह भ्रादत है कि जब देखो, तब वह एलिंगेशन्ज लगा देते हैं बिना उनको सबस्टेंशिएट किये हुए। अभी उन्होंने फिर ऐसी ही एलिंगेशन लगाई है। मैं प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि आप उसको रिकार्ड से निकाल दीजिये। अगर वह इस बारे में डेफ़िनेट है, तो वह इन व्यक्तियों के विरुद्ध चार्ज लायें।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : * *

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now this matter has come to an end.

श्री मधु लिमये : अगर आप आगे जायेंगे, तो मुझे व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाना पड़ेगा।

संसद्-कार्य विभाग में उपमंत्री (श्री मूलाल राव) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य, श्री बनर्जी, ने आपके प्रादेश के विरुद्ध जा कर जो आरोप लगाये हैं, आप कृपा करके उनको रिकार्ड से निकाल दीजिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will refer to the record. I will check it and get it removed.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह क्या हो रहा है ? इस तरह नहीं हो सकता है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He transgressed his limits. He had no business to bring in extraneous matter.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I was provoked.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I had said, "You can make a statement concerning the statement that I had made and clear your own position". Where was the necessity for bringing in other matters? There was no necessity, no justification.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं उठा सकते।

श्री मधु लिमये : कैसे नहीं उठा सकता हूँ? क्या आप मुझे व्यवस्था का प्रश्न भी नहीं उठाने देंगे ? आप हमें बता दीजिये कि आप ने रिकार्ड में से क्या काटा है। हम को पता चलना चाहिये। हमेशा यह होता है किये लोग अपने संख्या-बल के आधार पर आप को डराते-धमकाते हैं और आप को मजबूर करते हैं।

श्री डा० ना० तिवारी (गोपालगंज) : उल्टा चोर कोतवाल को डांटे।

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham (Visakhapatnam): On a point of order, Sir.

श्री मधु लिमये : सब से पहले मैंने पायंट ब्राफ़ ब्रांडर उठाया है। आपने पचासों सदस्यों को मौका दिया है, लेकिन मुझे नहीं बुलाया है। जो सदस्य पायंट ब्राफ़ ब्रांडर पर खड़ा होता है, पहले उसको मौका मिलना चाहिये।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Under what rule? What do you want to say?

श्री मधु लिमये : नियम 376 के मातहत। आप ने माननीय सदस्य को नियम 357 के मातहत व्यक्तिगत स्पष्टीकरण की इजाजत दी। आप ने कहा कि अगर कोई विवाद वाला मामला उठाया जायेगा, तो आप रोकेंगे। आप ने उनको रोका। लेकिन उसके बाद इन लोगों को हंगामा करने की क्या जरूरत

थी ? (व्यवधान) आप इस बात का जवाब दीजिये ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He brought in extraneous matter and, therefore, I stopped him.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह बाद में हुआ, लेकिन ये लोग बीस पच्चीस मिनट से हंगामा कर रहे हैं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You agree with me that he exceeded the limit?

श्री मधु लिमये : आप को रोकने का अधिकार है, लेकिन इन लोगों को बीस पच्चीस मिनट तक हंगामा करने का कोई अधिकार नहीं है ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : उन्होंने कोई नहीं किया है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : इस हंगामे को बीस पच्चीस मिनट हो गये हैं और आप कहते हैं कि उन्होंने कुछ नहीं किया है । आप धन्य हैं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They objected to only one sentence.

Shri S. K. Tapuriah (Pali): They cannot touch you for five years.... (Interruption).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whatever they objected I also objected.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह घटना तो अभी हुई है, लेकिन यह हंगामा पच्चीस मिनट से चल रहा है । खूब हंगामा करवाते हैं ये मंत्री ।

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: I rise on a point of order. Mr. Banerjee made some statement, there was a point of order raised by friends opposite, and there was a suggestion that that should be expunged. I would request you not to expunge it because I want to bring a motion of privilege against Mr. Banerjee so that the entire matter goes to the Privileges Committee. Mr. Banerjee made an allegation against not only two Ministers but also against other Ministers. All this should be considered by the Privileges Committee.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Viswanatham, you know law and you know the procedure very well. I had given him permission to make a personal explanation in the context of my statement or observation. I told him not to exceed the limit. But if he exceeds the limit and brings in some extraneous matter, then, certainly, I will examine the record and see that it does not go on record.

श्री जार्ज फरेनेग्डीच (दम्बई-दक्षिण) : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आप किस नियम के मातहत श्री बनर्जी के कुछ वाक्यों को रिकार्ड से हटाना चाहते हैं ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Viswanatham, do you agree with me or not?

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: I agree with you upto a particular point.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he exceeds the limit, what am I to do?

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: The Member has made an allegation against not only the two Ministers but also against other Ministers and the Prime Minister. Therefore, the matter must go to the Privilege Committee. How can you expunge it?

श्री जार्ज फरेनेग्डीच : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है । आप नियम 380 को देखिये ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please sit down.

I gave permission to him to make a personal explanation in the context of that observation and I immediately told him, "If you exceed the limit, I will not permit you". Now, if he exceeds the limit, that means he has done something without the permission of the Chair. Am I not right in seeing that it does not go on record?

श्री मधु लिमये : यह अधिकार नहीं है । यह तो तानाशाही अधिकार बन गया । नियमों में यह नहीं है ।

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: You have raised a point. Let me answer it, if you have a little patience.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am prepared to be patient with you but not with this type of (*Interruption*).

श्री तन्नेति विसुवानथम : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, प्राप नियम 380 को देखिये। इसमें लिखा है :

"If the Speaker is of opinion that words have been used in debate which are defamatory or indecent or unparliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order that such words be expunged...."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not called you.

श्री मधु लिसये : माननीय सदस्य पायट साफ़ फ़ाईर पर बोल रहे हैं।

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: According to you, the Member has exceeded your direction. (*Interruptions*). He has said one sentence more than what you wanted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What could be permissible, not only wanted. Now let us talk like lawyers.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: I agree with you. I am in complete agreement with you.

Having been said.... (*Interruption*). it has become a part of the record. Unless the Member says that he withdraws it, how can it be expunged, because other consequences follow on what he has said. He has maligned not only two Ministers but some more Ministers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have followed your argument. In the same fashion, we can argue. You argue more patiently and to the point. The question is this. If some Member of the House is more or less bent on inviting certain things and inviting in such a way that the House or any Member of the House should feel almost, compelled... (*Interruption*) to take it as a question of privilege, then

in such a position, as the guardian of the dignity of this House, is it not the responsibility—I am putting it to you as a lawyer—, is it not the responsibility of the Chair to see that no Member transgresses the limits; and if he transgresses the limits, then I will have to do... (*Interruptions*). Order, order. Mr. Viswanatham is on his legs.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: If what you say is right, i.e., because he has transgressed, if you want to expunge..

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not expunged. I have said that I will verify and if there is a transgression....

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: I agree with you.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If you agree with me, then it is all right. You may sit down.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: Assuming that there is a transgression... (*Interruptions*) what happens is this. If your suggestion is followed, anybody can make some statement, then you would expunge it and another and another will follow and then the whole record will become a farce. On the other hand, if what he has said goes into the record, that also, including the transgression of the Deputy-Speaker's orders, will go to the Privileges Committee. Supposing I transgress and talk something, which is not sense, against your direction and then you expunge, then another Member will speak, yet another Member will speak and so on without minding its being expunged. Therefore, please do not follow that line.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have followed your argument. Will you see rule 380?

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: You have perfectly got that right. But do not exercise that right.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If it is a defamatory statement, if it is a transgression of the limits prescribed and it could be... (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : नहीं, नहीं। यह कहाँ है उसमें ? यह बताइये कहाँ है ? प्रजातंत्र में और तानाशाही में बड़ा फर्क है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If all sorts of allegations are bandied about with a view to maligning, absolutely maliciously, is the Chair to sit quiet here? Will it add to the dignity of the Chair and the House? I am exercising my right with full discretion keeping in view all the observations that you have made. I will keep your observations in view.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: Just one more sentence. If he makes a very malicious statement, you have got power under rule 327 or 227 to directly refer it to the Committee of Privileges. You need not do anything; immediately you can haul him up before the Privileges Committee.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I will exercise that power. The Chair should exercise all the powers that are inherent here. As you know, certain powers are written and certain powers are inherent in the Chair. I shall invoke those powers, provided I feel justified in doing so. Therefore, I have said that I shall examine the record and take my decision.

Now, Shri K. P. Singh Deo:

Shri S. M. Banerjee: On a point of order....

Shri K. Lakkappa (Tumkur): On a point of order....

Shri Zulfiqar Ali Khan (Rampur): On a point of order....

Shri S. K. Tapuriah: You may kindly allow Shri Zulfiqar Ali Khan at least. He has never spoken before.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If he has not spoken before, I shall give him an opportunity some other time, not now.

So far as the matter raised by Shri S. M. Banerjee is concerned, that is closed. Now, we are discussing the Railway Demands.

Shri M. Y. Saleem (Nalgonda): We on this side of the House should also be permitted to say something.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : अध्यक्ष महोदय, व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। व्यवस्था का प्रश्न क्या मैं नहीं खड़ा कर सकता हूँ। . . . (व्यवधान) . . . व्यवस्था का प्रश्न खड़ा करने का क्या मुझे अधिकार नहीं है . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member has got any point of order regarding Shri K. P. Singh Deo's speech, then I am prepared to hear him. Otherwise, let him resume his seat.

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : नहीं, अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न इस मसले पर है . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is nothing before the House now except the Railway Demands.

Shri K. Lakkappa: On a point of order....

श्री जार्ज फरनेन्डीज : प्रोसीडिंग्स का एक्सपंज करने के बारे में मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have said nothing to that effect. I have only said that I shall examine the record. So, there is no question of any expunction now.

Shri S. Kundu (Balasore): I have a suggestion and also a point of order. Shri S. M. Banerjee wanted just one more minute's time. But the hon. Minister....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That matter is closed now. We have passed that stage. There is no point of order. Let the hon. Member resume his seat. This is not fair.

Shri S. Kundu: Shri S. M. Banerjee wanted only one more minute. But the hon. Minister has blocked it and we have spent 20 minutes on it. He thinks that because he is a Member of the Bhim Club he is very strong and he can do it. This is the threat from the Bhim Club....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.
Now, Shri K. P. Singh Deo;

14.37 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS), 1967-68—contd.

Shri K. P. Singh Deo (Dhenkanal): I have moved several cut motions to these Demands.

Cut Motion No. 220 relates to the urgency of the construction of a new railway link from Talcher to Bimlagarh in Orissa, which would connect Rourkela to Cuttack, since Rourkela is connected to Bimlagarh and Talcher is connected to Cuttack by metre gauge.

Cut Motion No. 221 refers to the urgency of construction of a new railway line connecting Ambaguda to Lanjigarh Road (DBK Railway). Cut Motion No. 222 refers to the urgency of the construction of a new railway line from Cuttack to Paradip Port in Orissa.

I have also moved cut motions Nos. 273, 543, 544, 536 and 537. All these are connected with each other. If these are implemented, it will have a profound effect upon the economy, industrial as well as agricultural, of Orissa at large as well as of the Union of India generally.

As you know, Orissa which has an area of more than 60,000 sq. miles and a population of more than 17½ million has hardly 908 miles of railway line, which works out to about 14 miles per every 1000 sq. miles, and 5.2 miles per every lakh of population, as compared to 31 miles per every 1000 sq. miles and 9.7 miles per lakh of population for the Union as a whole, which indicates that Orissa fares unfavourably in Railway communication as compared with the other States of the Indian Union.

Moreover, there is no interconnection between the railways existing in the western part of Orissa which is a

predominantly Adibasi area having vast forest resources but which is minerally rich and agriculturally a surplus area, and the coastal railways. During the last three years when Orissa was subjected to drought, it exposed the fact of the inadequacy of transport facilities when foodgrains had to be moved from one district to another and from one State to another. The inadequacy of the railway facilities affected the movement of food. The inadequate railway mileage in the State will also adversely affect the exploitation of known deposits of mineral resources as well as forest products which the present Government is trying to attempt and has already taken various measures to increase both the industrial and agricultural output. For this purpose, augmentation of railway communications in the State is absolutely essential.

Orissa's march forward in development to reach the standards of the more advanced States of the Union is to be expected. It is obvious that rapid industrial and agricultural expansion and the exploitation of the mineral wealth will depend mainly on the adequacy of the railway mileage represented by a network of railway linking the appropriate regions. During the Fourth Plan period, the Orissa Government have declared their intention to implement the Talcher industrial complex which, if implemented, will have immense possibilities for the future.

Also during the Fourth Plan period on wards, the entire area from Paradip port on the east coast upto Birmitrapur in the N.W. will be humming with activities and the operation of the various projects for the exploitation of the mineral wealth through the richest mineral belt from Keonjhar to Birmitrapur. All these areas which form the hinterland should be appropriately connected with the port by a direct railway link to facilitate large-scale movement for exports and imports through the port