

**Shri D. C. Sharma** (Gurdaspur): Sir, I want to make a submission. I do not know on what terms and under what conditions these Lobby Assistants, the so-called Lobby Assistants are appointed.

**Some hon. Members:** Why "so-called"?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** There was one Lobby Assistant and I reported his case to the Secretary at that time, that he was not very good in his dealings with the Members. But the Secretary took no notice of it. Then another Lobby Assistant came. He was doing good work. But he has been shunted away only because.... (Interruptions). He was shunted away only because, I think, he was trying to accommodate all the Members of the House. Now a third Lobby Assistant has been appointed. I do not know. I want to know how these Lobby Assistants are appointed, what are their qualifications.... (Interruptions).

**Shri Hem Barua:** Personal references like this should not be allowed to be made.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. I cannot discuss here how they are posted, what they do and so on. He will kindly resume his seat. I have said that if there has been some mistake, I will make inquiries into that.

There were 65 or 70 Calling Attention Notices with me this morning. Every one of them was read out to me. There were some about Manipur which I disallowed. Probably some mistake has occurred, some confusion arose in the mind of one of my staff and that wrong information has been given. I have already said that I will make inquiries into them. I think that should be the end of the matter.

**Shri Hem Barua:** May I submit that the Lobby Assistants have functioned well all along? They are very good. When you have given your ruling I do not understand why Pro-

fessor Sharma should try to change it.

**Shri S. M. Banerjee** (Kanpur): Sir, I want to know one thing.

**Mr. Speaker:** What is it?

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** You said that there was some confusion about the Calling Attention Notices. I want to know whether you have rejected the calling attention notice of mine one..

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not answering that.

**Shri Kapur Singh:** Sir, I submit that this House is entitled to a firm and clear clarification from you on the statement which has just been made by a very hon. and learned Member of this House regarding Lobby Assistants and so-called Lobby Assistants. Are they Lobby Assistants or so-called Lobby Assistants? This confusion must be removed.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am not such an expert in English language. Sometimes I do not distinguish between the two. But there was no need for the hon. Member to call him "so-called Lobby Assistant". Perhaps, the hon. Member had some grievance against some Lobby Assistant and, therefore, he had been expressing that.

12.13 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

#### RICE-MILLING INDUSTRY (REGULATION AND LICENSING) SECOND AMENDMENT RULES

**The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri Shinde):** Sir, on behalf of Shri Govinda Menon I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation and Licensing) Second Amendment Rules, 1966 published in Notification No. GSR 259 in Gazette of India dated the 19th February, 1966 under sub-section (4) of section 22 of the Rice-Milling Indus-

[Shri Shinde]

try (Regulation) Act, 1958. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5703/66].

**ANNUAL REPORT OF INDIAN CENTRAL SPICES AND CASHEW NUT COMMITTEE**

**Shri Shinde:** Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Annual Report of the Indian Central Spices and Cashewnut Committee for the year 1963-64 (Hindi version). [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5702/66].

12.14 hrs.

**RELEASE OF MEMBER**

(*Shri Badrudduja*)

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to inform the House that I have received the following communication, dated the 5th March, 1966, from the Superintendent, Alipore Special Jail:

"I have the honour to inform you that Syed Badrudduja, Member, Lok Sabha, who was detained in this Jail from the 10th September, 1965, was released from this Jail on the 4th March, 1966, under Government Orders."

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** Can we have an assurance that he will not be re-arrested?

12.14½ hrs.

**RE: PAROLE OF SHRI UMANATH**

**Mr. Speaker:** Is the Home Minister making a statement about Shri Umanath?

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda):** When I am making a statement in the afternoon I will say something about the question of parole also.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad):** May I make a request to you about this matter?

**Mr. Speaker:** Since the Minister is going to make a statement, he should wait till then.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** Sir, I want to bring some facts to your notice before he makes the statement. As I may not be present then, kindly accommodate me. I only wish to state that when on the 2nd of this month, last Wednesday, the House discussed this matter—the right of a Member of the House, a detenu on parole to attend the sittings, the session of Parliament—I was gratified to find that my view that he is entitled to attend the House received wide support from all sections of the House, except for a stray voice here and there. I am sorry to say, I am constrained to say that the Government, through their officers, have acted in this matter improperly, to say the least, to put it very mildly. When the House is seized of the matter, when the Government promised a statement today—and they are going to make a statement today—I learn on reliable authority, from an authentic source, that a sub-Inspector of Police of that area served a fresh order on Shri Umanath, a Member of the House, the detenu on parole, to the effect that under the present conditions of parole, he should not go to Delhi. That was a fresh order served, the same evening, conveying the order of the Madras Government, soon after the discussion in the House on the 2nd morning—it was served the same evening on the 2nd—saying that under present conditions of parole, he should not go to Delhi.

**Mr. Speaker:** That is all. (*Interruption*). Order, order.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** In this connection, may I also mention that last year, if I remember aright, in August or September, 1965, when there was a writ petition pending before the Supreme Court, the same detenu, the same Member of the House, along with another colleague of his, Shri Nambiar, had come to Delhi on the written permission of the Madras