

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** यह बाजार नहीं है, यह उन्होंने कहा है ।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मेहरबानी करके नियम 357 देखें जिम पर कि आपने सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह को बोलने का मौका दिया । उसमें लिखा है :

"In this case no debatable matter may be brought forward and no debate shall arise."

तो यह बिल्कुल साफ बात है कि उन्होंने यहां पर विवादास्पद बातें उठाईं जब आपने इनको मौका दिया और मैं इसी तरीके से . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** कोई विवाद की बात उन्होंने बिल्कुल नहीं उठाई । सिर्फ इनकार किया ।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** जब कि मैं कल साफ कह चुका हूँ कि सिर्फ एक ही जहाज पर एक हजार टन चावल गायब हुआ और यह मैं नहीं कह चुका हूँ आपके कागज कह रहे हैं जो कागज आपने हमको दिए अपने दफ्तर से उन कागजों में है कि 24-5-64 को जब यह अन्न मंत्री थे तब राजीव नाम के जहाज पर चावल आना था 6987 टन और आया 6004 टन । यानी 983 टन चावल गायब । 983 टन का मतलब हुआ 980 हजार जिसके मानी होते हैं चार पांच लाख रुपये सिर्फ एक जहाज का यह है और ऐसे पचासों जहाजों से गायब हैं तो ऐसी हालत में जब इस तरह की बहस हो तो उसको किसी नतीजे पर कहीं तो आप पहुंचाये बरना यहां पर बहस करने का नतीजा क्या होगा ? मंत्री यह सब काम करते रहेंगे । हम मेहनत करके यह सब पता लगायेंगे और यहां रखेंगे तो मंत्री आकर कह देंगे कि यह बात गलत है, बिना तफसील के है, झूठ है तो इसका कहीं कोई नतीजा तो निकलना चाहिए । मैं चार महीने से आपके सामने यह सवाल रख

रहा हूँ । पहला दस्तावेज जो सदन पटल पर यहां रखा गया था वह सितम्बर महीने में रखा गया था आपके सामने और फिर उसके बाद एक यह कागज आपके पास एक महीने से है । यह सारे कागज आपके पास हैं । इनके होते हुए आप हमारे ऊपर निरर्थक ढंग से यह आरोप लगाने देते हैं कि हम यह आरोप कहीं अपने घर में बैठे हुए लगा देते हैं . . .

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** बहुत अच्छा, मैंने सुन लिया । आप इतने धरसे से रख रहे हैं मगर मैं उसकी बहस तो नहीं छोड़ सकता । आप और कोई दें और उसमें बायपासदा तौर पर हो तो बहस हाउस सुन सकता है, उस पर मैं तो फैसला नहीं दे सकता हूँ । आप यह चाहते हैं कि आप आरोप लगायें तो किसी को इतना कहने का भी हक नहो कि यह गलत है? वह सिर्फ मान जाये और खामोश बैठ रहे ? मैं इसमें इत्तफाक नहीं करता ।

**डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया :** मंत्री से कहिये कि राजीव के बारे में बतलायें . . . (ब्यवधान) . . . यह सब तफसील के आरोप इनके ऊपर हैं . . . (ब्यवधान)

13.43 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. RECENT LEGISLATION IN NEPAL AFFECTING RIGHTS OF INDIANS

The Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs (Shri Dinesh Singh): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a Statement on the recent legislation in Nepal affecting rights of Indians. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-7497/68].

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): Sir, you promised to call me. . .

Mr. Speaker: Yes, what is his point of order?

## Report

**Shri Joachim Alva:** Sir, I want to ask you whether Shri Bagri can change four places in one day? Can he jump from place to place and speak? One day when your Chair is vacant he will jump to your place and speak from there.

**Mr. Speaker:** He might not have intended that up to now, but giving him a suggestion might encourage him.

**Shri Joachim Alva:** The other day also he changed four places. I want you to permit him to speak from one place only.

**Mr. Speaker:** As I have not been able to allot him a particular place, I have to tolerate it.

**Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati):** Sir, what happened to item No. 20 of the Order Paper?

**Mr. Speaker:** That statement has been placed on the Table.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Sir, I wrote to you that I want to seek a clarification. Can I seek that clarification from the Prime Minister?

**Mr. Speaker:** Let Shri Dinesh Singh come, I will allow him.

**Shri Hem Barua:** Sir, when he comes...

**Mr. Speaker:** I will call him. Let Shri Dinesh Singh be asked to be present.

13.45 hrs.

MOTION RE: ELEVENTH REPORT  
OF THE COMMITTEE OF  
PRIVILEGES

**Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the genesis of the subject matter over which the Eleventh Report of the Committee of Privileges has been presented to this House on the 30th November, 1966 has been

given in the opening paragraph of this report. It arises out of a question of privilege, raised by Shri Madhu Limaye on the 18th August and referred to the Committee by the House, against Col. Amrik Singh with regard to a letter dated 4th August, 1966 written by Col. Amrik Singh to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, which mentioned of a document alleged to have been sent by Shri Jit Paul showing an entry of payment of a sum of Rs. 40,000 against the name of Sardar Hukam Singh, Speaker, Lok Sabha.

It will be recalled that there was a lapse of a few days, I think three or four days, before the matter was referred to this Committee and between the date on which the letter of Shri Madhu Limaye reached your hands. As subsequent developments in this case show, this was one of the most unfortunate things that could have happened, because a careful perusal of the report shows that, throughout, the Committee was burdened with the most terrible alternative of either paying attention to the words which you spoke when you referred the matter to the House or to proceed in accordance with the rules which are mentioned in the book of Rules of Procedure. The words with which you referred this case to the Committee were, in substance, to the effect that if such a document at all exists or ever existed then "I shall resign my office". It became a burden on the mind of the Committee. It would seem from a perusal of the report that they felt that either they have to proceed in accordance with the requirements of the Rules of Procedure and find out the facts in regard to the matter referred to it, or to resign to the alternative which you had offered to this House, namely, to resign your seat if the existence of this document at all can be shown to be a fact.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does he mean to say that the Committee came to that conclusion because they had before them the fact that I had said that I would resign?