

13 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE  
AGAINST MINISTER OF EDUCA-  
TION AND YOUTH SERVICES

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday, the Business Advisory Committee had decided that since we had lost two days and we were very much behind schedule and we have such a tight programme and we cannot find time enough even for Government business, we should sit during the lunch hour also and also on Saturday, and also sit for some extra time at the end of the day.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI (Kendrapara): No, no. We have not accepted that.

MR. SPEAKER: So, let hon. Members stick to the time suggested by the Business Advisory Committee.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: We shall discuss it when the motion comes.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): May I make one submission?

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: You have already taken a decision before the motion has been adopted?

MR. SPEAKER: I have not taken any decision. The hon. Minister will be making the motion in a regular way. Now, we have decided to sit during the lunch hour also for consideration of the Bill. Before I allow the hon. Minister to bring forward that motion at the proper time, namely item No. 9, there is item 2A which we have to consider now, and that concerns the motion about the statements of Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao again. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta has written to me and also Shri N. Shivappa. Of course, Shri N. Shivappa has completed his speech, but he still wants to speak, but I am not going to allow him, because he has said enough. Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta says that there were three motions, and one was in his name, and he has asked me why he has not been heard. If we go on in this manner, I think I would better fix time for this rather than allow this debate without any regular motion. This means that every day

we have one hour daily after Question Hour for this; that is, the dispute about 5th November, 5th December and 24th November. This springs up every day. So, I have decided this. I had made certain observations that if instead of all that. . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): What is 5th November? Where is the letter of 5th November?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member speaks on it every day, and still he is showing ignorance about it?

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao's statement about the CSIO says . . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Now, I know it.

MR. SPEAKER: If he knows it, why does he ask me? About 5th of November and 5th of December I had made that observation . . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: The letter of 5th November should be laid on the Table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no dispute about it, about 5th November, 5th December and 24th November. But the hon. Member Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta says that he wants to speak before I give my ruling . . .

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I want only five or six minutes. I do not want more time.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA (Hassan): I would like to make one submission.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I did not speak at all, and you had promised to give me time yesterday.

AN HON. MEMBER: Send it to the Privileges Committee straightway.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: Kindly permit two minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow him now. He has spoken already.

SHRI SURENDRANATH DWIVEDI: May I rise on a point of order? Without adopting the motion, how can we carry on? It is time for lunch, and we should adjourn for lunch now. How can you dispense with the lunch hour without adopting the motion?

MR. SPEAKER: We shall take up that motion afterwards. But since the hon. Member Keeps on writing

[Mr. Speaker]

to me every day and he has written to me today also, I shall allow him five or six minutes, and I shall give my ruling tomorrow.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मेरा कहना यह है कि डा० राव ने जो बयान उस दिन दिया था वह जान बूझ कर गलत दिया था। यह जानते हुए कि उनके पास तथ्य हैं, यह जानते हुए कि उनके पास पत्र आया, उसके बाद भी उन्होंने जान बूझ कर गलत बयान दिया। इसके परेलल अगर कोई केस है तो यू० के० का प्रोफ़्यूमो का केस है। उस केस में प्रोफ़्यूमों को स्तीफा देना पड़ा था। मेरा कहना यह है कि डा० राव को भी इस्तीफा देना चाहिये।

केस क्या है? मंत्री महोदय ने यह कहा था। मैं कोट करता हूँ :

"The fact that certain military documents were missing from the office of the Central Scientific Instruments Organisation, Chandigarh had not been brought to my notice by the office of the CSIR, and the first information I got was from *The Statesman* dated the 5th December, 1969."

उन्होंने कहा कि जो डाकुमेंट खो गये हैं उनकी मुझे पहले पढ़ल इनफॉर्मेशन स्टेट्समैन मे मिली पांच दिसम्बर को। मेरा कहना यह है कि जो स्टेटमेंट ऑरिजनल इन्होंने किया और जो तथ्य मैं सामने रखूंगा उनसे यह साफ हो जाएगा कि इन्होंने जान बूझ कर गलत कहा। इन्होंने कहा कि पांच तारीख का जब इन्होंने स्टेट्समैन पढ़ा केवल उस समय यह मालूम हुआ, उससे पहले मालूम नहीं था। आपने कल आवज्जब किया था कि कापी या चिट्ठी मिली, यह उससे सम्बन्धित नहीं है। रिलेवेंट क्या है? वह है जो इन्होंने अपना बयान देते समय कहा था कि मुझे सब से पहले इस चीज के बारे में जब मैंने स्टेट्समैन पढ़ा उस समय मालूम हुआ।

मैंने सवाल किया था कि क्या यह सही है कि डायरेक्टर साहब ने एक चिट्ठी प्राइम मिनिस्टर को लिखी शायद 26 या 27 नवम्बर को जिसकी

कापी आपको भेजी जिसमें यह सब तफ्सील दी थी? उस पर आपने क्या कार्रवाई की? यह मैंने पूछा था। इसके बाद सोधी जी ने पूछा। मैं कोट करता हूँ :

"According to my information, the Director, CSIO, wrote to the hon. Minister Dr. Rao on the 5th November, that is, one month ago, informing him of the missing design, but the hon. Minister is today expressing his ignorance here. Why is he expressing that ignorance? Is he hiding something?"

डा० राव क्या कहते हैं? वह कहते हैं :

"The hon. Member was pleased to observe that the Minister has received a letter on 5th November from Dr. Gill about the loss of a document. I categorically deny the statement. I should, like any committee—I will like a parliamentary committee, I do not mind, in regard to this statement. I should like to tell the House that as far as I am concerned, the first time I came to know about the reported loss of document was on the 5th morning when I read *The Statesman* . . ."

दुबारा इन्होंने कहा है जब मोधी साहब और मैंने प्वाइंट आउट किया कि आपको 26 या 27 तारीख को प्राइम मिनिस्टर को लिखी हुई कापी भी मिली। उसके बाद भी मंत्री महोदय क्या कहते हैं इसको भी आप मुन लीजिये। वह कहते हैं :

"I would like to tell the House that as far as I am concerned, the first time I came to know about the reported loss of document was on the 5th morning, when I read *The Statesman*."

शुरू में इन्होंने कहा कि मुझे स्टेट्समैन से पता चला। उसके बाद उनको उनकी गलती प्वाइंट आउट की गई कि यह बात ठीक नहीं है लेकिन उसके बाद भी वह कहते हैं कि नहीं मुझे स्टेट्समैन से पता चला। मेरा कहना यह है कि यह डैलीब्रेट है, जानबूझ कर कहा गया है। जब हमने कहा तो वह कह सकते थे कि मैं इसकी इनक्वायरी करूंगा, जांच करूंगा। लेकिन उन्होंने एक स्पिरिट आफ ब्रेवेडो में कहा कि पार्लियमेंटरी

कमेटी बनाओं, मैं इस्तीफा देने के लिए तैयार हूँ। यह दुबारा इन्होंने कहा।

डा० राव आगे कहते हैं :

"The Parliamentary Committee that I offered was not on the subject of Chandigarh institute. It was in respect of the categorical statement made by my hon. friend Shri M. L. Sondhi that I mislead the House by saying that I did not know anything about it."

इसके बाद भी यह कहते हैं। आखिर में जो इन्होंने कहा और जो मैंने कोट किया है उसका सम्बन्ध इस डाक्यूमेंट से नहीं था, उसका जो सम्बन्ध है, वह 25 नवम्बर से था और उससे था जिस में डा० गिल को हैरास करने की बात थी। लास आफ फाइल का सम्बन्ध उसके साथ नहीं है।

मेरा कहना यह है कि इन्होंने एक बार नहीं दो बार नहीं तीन-तीन बार लगातार और याद दिलाने के बावजूद भी यह कहा कि मुझे यह स्टेट्समैन से मालूम हुआ। सवाल यह नहीं जैसा आपने कल कहा था कि चिट्ठी की नकल मिली या चिट्ठी मिली। वह यह नहीं कहते हैं। वह तो यह कहते हैं कि मैंने स्टेट्समैन में पढ़ा तब मुझे मालूम हुआ, उससे पहले मालूम नहीं हुआ मेरा कहना यह है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर की चिट्ठी इनको मिली या नकल मिली, इन्होंने उसके उपर नोटिंग भी की और उस में यह था कि हकसर से बात कर लो। मेरा कहना यह है कि जब इन्होंने खुद आफर किया है तो मैं मांग करता हूँ कि अगर वह आनेस्ट हैं तो उनको स्वयं इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिए या पार्लियामेन्टरी कमेटी के लिए तैयार हो जाना चाहिये। अन्यथा मैं चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम आइंदा मंत्री महोदय सोच समझ कर बात किया करें, जोश में न आ जाया करें, इसको क्लास रूम उनको नहीं समझना चाहिये। जो कुछ कहें। ठीक कहें।

प्राइम फेसी केस मैंने आपके सामने रख दिया है कि उन्होंने रिपीटिडली यह बात कही।

अब आप इसको कमेटी आफ प्रिविलेजिज के सामने भेज दें ताकि जो तथ्य है वह सामने आ जाए। कमेटी फाइल को भी देख लेगी, कोन सी तारीख को हुआ यह भी देख लेगी और इसको भी देख लेगी कि पांच तारीख को उनके पास पहुंचा या नहीं। ये सब बातें उसके बाद पता चल सकती हैं।

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: I only seek your permission to lay these papers on the Table of the House. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member had concluded his speech already.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: I am not going to speak now. I am only going to lay these \*papers on the Table of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: This is the fourth day that this is going on. So, I mentioned yesterday what I felt and I gave a clear explanation for that; the letter which he received on the 24th, the 24th or 27th, I am not sure about it. . .

AN HON. MEMBER: 25th.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . had been addressed to him, enclosing a copy of the Director's complaint to the Prime Minister; it was a forwarding letter of a few lines, and his explanation was that it was full of complaints against the police and harassment and all that. He just missed it, and at the end of it he mentioned in his speech also about some dispute when Dr. Gill complained that there was harassment, saying something about Mr. Sood having been responsible for all that. After that, he said it was a genuine mistake, there was an erroneous impression and if the House felt about it, he would regret. He also expressed his regret. I said yesterday that if this is the case, we had better drop the matter. So I would drop the matter. But some members said that I should refer it to the House. If the House accepts his explanation. . . .

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

\*The Speaker not having subsequently accorded the necessary permission, the papers were not treated as laid on the Table.

**SHRI KANWARLAL GUPTA:** There should be an unconditional apology. Then we can drop it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** He has already expressed regret. I drop the matter. I do not hold the motion in order.

13.11 hrs.

**REMISSION OF SENTENCE FOR CONTEMPT OF THE LOK SABHA**

**SHRI NATH PAI (Rajapur):** Mr. Speaker, I have already written to you about the incident that took place in the House the other day when three visitors from the Gallery dropped some pamphlets.

It is one of the privileges belonging to this House that lots of our countrymen look upon Parliament as the ultimate arbiter for redressal of their grievances, but it does not mean that the proceedings of the House should be interrupted. I had written to you about a motion in this respect. I am in a position to tell you that the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Opposition have conveyed to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs that they are in agreement with my proposal.

**MR. SPEAKER:** This is about the remission of the sentence. This Motion may be moved. But he might please tell them not to do it again. This has happened in State legislatures also. This is not the proper way of bringing matters to our notice.

**THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH):** We are entirely in your hands. I think the general consensus is in favour of remission of the sentence to the period of imprisonment already undergone. I move:

"This House resolves that the sentence of imprisonment awarded by this House on the 13th December 1969 to the persons calling themselves (1) Shri Tarachand C. Shah, (2) Shri Krishna P. Patil and (3) Shri Gulabrao R. Deshmukh for having thrown leaflets in the House from the Visitors' Gallery and thereby having committed contempt of the House, be reduced to

the imprisonment already undergone and they be released at 4 P.M. today."

**MR. SPEAKER:** The question is:

"This House resolves that the sentence of imprisonment awarded by this House on the 13th December 1969 to the persons calling themselves (1) Shri Tarachand C. Shah, (2) Shri Krishna P. Patil and (3) Shri Gulabrao R. Deshmukh for having thrown leaflets in the House from the Visitors' Gallery and thereby having committed contempt of the House, be reduced to the imprisonment already undergone and they be released at 4 P.M. today."

*The motion was adopted.*

**MR. SPEAKER:** Let these people be released at 4 P.M. today. I would ask the hon. Member to tell them that they should not repeat this kind of thing, not even in the State legislatures.

13.14 hrs.

**PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE**  
**EMPLOYEES' PROVIDENT FUNDS (FIFTH AMENDMENT) SCHEME**

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT AND REHABILITATION (SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD):** I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Employees' Provident Funds (Fifth Amendment) Scheme, 1969, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 2686 in Gazette of India dated the 29th November, 1969, under subsection (2) of section 7 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2407/69.]

**REPORT ON DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME AND LEVELS OF LIVING PART II**

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C. SETHI):** I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Report of the Committee on Distribution of Income and Levels of Living—Part II—Changes in Levels of Living. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2408/69.]