

12.23 hrs.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

REPLIES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Shri A. C. Guha: Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing replies to the recommendations of the Estimates Committee which were not furnished by Government in time for inclusion in the relevant Reports:

- (i) Statement showing the replies to the recommendations noted in Chapter IV of the Fourteenth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha).
- (ii) Statement showing the replies to the recommendations noted in Chapter IV of the Sixteenth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha).
- (iii) Statement showing the replies to the recommendations noted in Chapter IV of the Twenty-seventh Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha).
- (iv) Statement showing the replies to the recommendations noted in Chapter V of the Thirty-eighth Report of the Estimates Committee (Third Lok Sabha).

12.24 hrs.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

MINUTES

Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the minutes of the sittings (27th to 31st) of the Committee on Private

1861 (Ai) LSD—4.

Members' Bills and Resolutions held during the current Session.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the Minutes of the Seventh sitting of the Committee on Absence of Members from the Sitings of the House held during the current session.

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the Minutes of the Fifth sitting of the Committee on Government Assurances held during the current Session.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, I find this time that Mr. Khadilkar has laid on the Table of the House the minutes of the sittings only today. May I request you therefore to take up this item tomorrow? We would like to study the report and minutes. Report is with us but not the minutes. The minutes help us sometimes to study better the reports, Minutes are not usually placed separately, but since they have been placed now, it would help us if this item is taken up tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Minutes are not necessary for the study of reports. It is all mentioned in the reports, who is granted leave, etc. At the end of the session it is usual to place the minutes. Otherwise only the reports are placed.

12.26 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON ABSENCE OF
MEMBERS

SEVENTH REPORT

Mr. Speaker: The Committee on Absence of Members from the Sitings of the House in their Seventh Report have recommended that leave of absence may be granted to the following

[Mr. Speaker]

Members for the period indicated against their names:

- (1) Shri Shankarrao Shantaram More—
14th September to 21st September, 1963 (Fifth Session).
18th November to 21st December, 1963 (Sixth Session).
- (2) Raja P. C. Deo Bhanj—
13th August to 21st September, 1963 (Fifth Session).
- (3) Shri Lal Shyamshah—
13th August to 21st September, 1963 (Fifth Session).
- (4) Shri Bholaram Paradhi—
13th August to 19th September, 1963 (Fifth Session).
- (5) Shri Jai Bahadur Singh—
18th November to 10th December, 1963 (Sixth Session).
- (6) Shri Dasaratha Deb—
18th November to 21st December, 1963 (Sixth Session).
- (7) Shri Ghyasuddin Ahmad—
18th November to 21st December, 1963 (Sixth Session).

I take it that the House agrees with the recommendations of the Committee.

Several Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The Members will be informed accordingly.

12.27 hrs.

STATEMENT REGARDING ARREST OF MEMBER

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Hajarna-

vis): With your permission I would like to make a statement on behalf of Shri Nanda. When the Speaker announced to the House on 12th December, 1963, the arrest of Shri Mauriya, a member of the House, under sub-rule (5) of Rule 41 of the Defence of India Rules, some members had expressed concern and asked for full facts of the case which had led to the arrest of this Member. I have since ascertained from the Government of Uttar Pradesh the circumstances leading to his arrest.

2. According to the Government of Uttar Pradesh, for the last several years Shri Mauriya had been indulging in a campaign of hatred amongst the Scheduled Castes and the Muslims against the members of the other castes among the Hindus. In the past also action had to be taken by the Government of Uttar Pradesh when he tried to foment trouble. On 27th August, 1957 he was convicted under Section 107/117 Criminal Procedure Code by the City Magistrate, Aligarh and was bound down to maintain the peace through a personal bond of Rs. 1,000. In particular, the speeches delivered by him in April-May this year were considered highly offensive by the Government of Uttar Pradesh. In these speeches, he threatened subversion of Government and declared that there would be a mass rising in a couple of years and that there would be a rebellion any day to liberate the Scheduled Castes from centuries of slavery. The tone and contents of the speeches were alleged to be such as to excite disaffection towards Government established by law in India and to promote feelings of enmity and hatred between different communities. In the opinion of the Government of Uttar Pradesh they attract the definition of "prejudicial act" given in clauses (e) and (g) of sub-rule (6) of Rule 35 of the Defence of India Rules. The Government of Uttar Pradesh could have even detained him under clause (b) of sub-rule (1) of