

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalaphuza): What about Shri Govinda Menon? Shri Govinda Menon is involved in it.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want an answer from Shri Govinda Menon.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There cannot be two statements.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I want to make a submission only.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am sorry.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): We shall sit till midnight. Why shut out the Members?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I had wanted to know whether the Minister of State for Food and Agriculture had said this or not and I was told by the office that the Minister made the statement outside; so, he cannot say anything.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a separate matter altogether.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: But as far as this statement is concerned, I want to have a clarification because it is not an answer. I want to know from the Minister whether the Plan was finalised on the 11th. This is what I want to know.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No questions are allowed.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: It is a clarification that I ask.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Madhu Limaye to lay a statement.

15-16 hrs.

STATEMENT BY MEMBER UNDER DIRECTION 115 AND REPLY BY MINISTER THERETO RE: PROPOSED ARREST OF DR. TEJA

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप नियम 115 के अनुसार

चलिये। आप सब को नियम दिखा रहे हैं। मैं भी आपको नियम 115 दिखा रहा हूँ। आप नियमों के अनुसार चलिये। नियम तो सब के लिये हैं मेरे लिये नियम क्यों नहीं हैं ?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a second statement.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasargod): I have been in Parliament and so many times I have seen that questions are asked. I know why an opportunity is not given to me. It is because I am sitting quiet. That is the reason.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Under direction 115 no questions are asked.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Clarifications were sought under one rule or the other. It was just now asked and given.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The direction says:—

“The member may place before the Speaker such evidence as he may have in support of his allegation.”

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I know the rule. I have read the rule.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप इस को पूरा पढ़िये। फिर हम को मौका मिलेगा अपना बयान पढ़ने का।

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalaphuza): Shri Poonacha should explain. Shri Govinda Menon quoted him at Ernakulam on the 11th that he told him that allotments were made in the Plan. How are there these two different statements within a period of two days?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Shri C. M. Poonacha): I just do not know who has quoted me and where.

Shri Madhu Limaye: On a point of order.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Sir, a statement is made by a

Member; the Minister has a prior look at it and then he prepares a statement. Now, there was a very important statement referring to one of his colleagues in the Ministry and he does not even refer to it in his answer. I shall take it that he has made a true statement and he has no cause to deny it.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: On the 9th when specifically questions were put here, it was said that it would be known on the 21st or 22nd only when it is finalised. The next day the Minister goes and say this there. Why does he not say whether he said that or not?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The procedure is that a statement is made by the Member and the Minister and they form part of the record.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: This is not the procedure to be followed by a Minister to make political propaganda.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have brought in the Food Minister also.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, I rise on a point of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने अभी श्री गोपालन को कहा, "जलो वि प्रोसीड्यूर"। क्या आप आधे मिनट में बदल जायेंगे ? लेंट अस फालो वि प्रोसीड्यूर ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please sit down. Only one statement can be made.

Shri Madhu Limaye: I am extremely sorry, there is no such rule. We will follow only the Rules of Procedure, nothing else.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please hear me.

Shri Madhu Limaye: It is on the Order Paper.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am reading from Shri Madhu Limaye's letter written to the Secretary, Lok Sabha.

Shri Madhu Limaye: I object to your reading my letter.

मेरे पत्र को पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है ।
मेरा पत्र नियम नहीं है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: "Since I am not reading out my statement under Direction 115 today, I suggest, the Secretariat to circulate the statement as to well as the Minister's reply with the parliamentary papers."

You have given an undertaking that you will not read it.

श्री मधु लिमये : पत्र की तारीख और समय बताइये ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If you had not written the letter, it would not have been admitted.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह पत्र कब दिया ? उससे पहले ही आर्डर पेपर आ चुका है । इस तरह से नहीं चल सकता है, इस पत्र को आपने क्यों पढ़ा ? उस का कोई संबंध नहीं है, यह बात बहुत अनडिजायरेबल है । यह आर्डर पेपर पर आ गया है । मैं उसका कारण बताता हूँ । मिनिस्टर ने ईमानदारी से स्टेटमेंट नहीं दिया है । उन्होंने खेद प्रकट नहीं किया है ।

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order. Shri Madhu Limaye, please lay it on the Table of the House. It is on the basis of your letter that I am asking you.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरे पत्र का कोई मूल्य नहीं है । दल्ल आर सुप्रोम ।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear my point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order.

Shri Madhu Limaye: Let us go by the Rules of Procedure and nothing else.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This is my point of order.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why waste time?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We should not waste time. I am afraid this may not be construed that we are wasting time. We do not want to waste time. These are the Rules . . .

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Defence (Shri A. M. Thomas): The country very well knows it.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You are the Defence Minister. Defend the country; do not defend the Chair.

Sir, I invite your kind attention to the Order Paper of today. There is a heading 'Statements Under Direction 115'. Item 24 is that Shri A. K. Gopalan is to make a statement and Shri N. Sanjiva Reddy to make a statement in reply thereto. Item 25 is that Shri Madhu Limaye is to lay a statement on the Table.

Please refer to Direction 115. I would read the whole of it. It says:

- "(1) A member wishing to point out any mistake or inaccuracy in a statement made by a Minister or any other member shall, before referring to the matter in the House, write to the Speaker pointing out the particulars of the mistake or inaccuracy and seek his permission to raise the matter in the House.
- (2) The member may place before the Speaker such evidence as he may have in support of his allegation.
- (3) The Speaker may if he thinks fit, bring the matter to the notice of the Minister or the member concerned for the purpose of ascertaining the factual position in regard to the allegation made.
- (4) The Speaker may then, if he thinks it necessary, permit the member who made the allegation to raise the matter in the House and the member

so permitted shall, before making the statement, inform the Minister or the member concerned.

- (5) The Minister or the member concerned may make a statement in reply with the permission of the Speaker and after having informed the other member concerned."

My submission is only this that there is no provision for laying the statement on the Table. The provision is very simple that after ascertaining the fact from the Member about the inaccuracy or other thing pointed out by the Member, if you come to the conclusion in your wisdom that this should be allowed, the Member shall make the statement.

Secondly, the facts were brought to the House concerning Dr. Teja. Why was Dr. Teja not arrested? The whole question started from that. We contended in the House that Dr. Teja was being shielded by some people, whether it is the Home Minister or the Finance Minister or the Aviation Minister or the Transport Minister and so on.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That has nothing to do with the point of order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I am arguing the case. You may kindly allow the statement to be made. There are important revelations made. My submission is that he should make the statement and the Minister also should make the statement and this House should be allowed to put as many questions as possible.

There is a case against Dr. Teja. Dr. Teja has gone out. I am definitely of the opinion that some people have conspired to send him out. That is quite clear. That Home Ministry should be in the dock because of their inefficiency. They did not allow the Enforcement Officer to prosecute Dr. Teja. That is the reason why he had the audacity to go out of the country in the month of May, 1966.

I request you to kindly allow the statement to be made under Direction 115. Under Direction 115, a statement cannot be laid on the Table. That is my point of order. I want your ruling on that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him be brief. He may read it. Let us not waste time.

Shri Madhu Limaye: I am not wasting the time. I want to save the time of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Read the statement only.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर मंत्री महोदय अभी भी अफसोस और खेद प्रकट करने के लिये तैयार है कि उन्होंने मेरे ऊपर "वाईल्ड एजिजेन्स" लगाने और "स्कैंडल" फैलाने का चार्ज लगाया, और अब साफ हो गया कि मेरी बात सही है, तो अब वह खेद प्रकट करेंगे तो मैं अपना बयान मेज पर रखूंगा।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not want any speech to be made. Only read the statement. That is all.

Shri Madhu Limaye: Sir, during the course of the discussion on the Jayanti Shipping Bill on 24th August, 1966, I moved a motion of adjournment of Debate under Rules 109 and 340. Among the reasons that I adduced in support of the motion, one was the failure of the Government to disclose the following information:

That when Dr. Teja was here in India last a proposal was made for his arrest by the Enforcement Branch (Finance Ministry). The proposal was turned down by the Government. Now, who was responsible for this veto: Finance Minister, Home Minister, Transport Minister or Prime Minister? I received no reply.

The Prime Minister, it may be recalled, had said on 24th August.

"बाहर से डाक्टर तेजा को गिरफ्तार करना हमारे हाथ में नहीं। हम उन को

गिरफ्तार करने के खिनाफ नहीं है मगर मुश्किल यह है... (अवधान)

There have to be extradition orders if Dr. Teja is in France. We have no such treaty with France."

On 25th, I again moved adjournment of the debate on the Bill and said that the position with regard to Enforcement Directorate's arrest proposal should be clarified.

I repeated this at least thrice through interpellations during the Minister's reply in the resumed debate on the Bill on 25th August.

Now what was the Minister's reply to my repeated interpellations? He said (on 25th August):

"श्री मधु लिमये : उसी वक्त एन्फोर्स-मेंट ब्रांच ने कहा था कि गिरफ्तार कीजिए। आप ने नहीं किया।

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: That is totally wrong. I do not know how my hon. friend gets such ideas. He gets only such ideas. Nobody said that he should not be arrested. He must accept the information that is before me. They never said that he is going to be arrested and nobody said, "do not arrest". It was discussed in the Home Minister's House and it was decided that we may get better information and material. It was the Enforcement people who gave this information and said, "wait for some time; now gather the material, evidence and information and then we shall pick him up." At that stage he was in India to seek the permission of the Government to sell his ships."

And again a question was asked by me:

"**Shri Madhu Limaye:** When was Dr. Teja in India last, and.

(b) whether the Enforcement before his departure from India Directorate suggested his arrest last and ...

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: He raised it, and I answered it.

Shri Madhu Limaye: "whether the Government turned it down?"

यह तो हुआ हमारे और आप के बीच में ।

During the clause by clause consideration, I repeated my question and warned Mr. Reddy that he should give a careful thought-out answer. I had even warned him on 24th August about my raising a Privilege Motion against him. But the Minister did not correct himself. He said that he had already answered that.

According to my information, Dr. Teja was in India in the first fortnight of May, 1966. The Enforcement Director, I understand, made a proposal for his arrest around the 8th/9th of May. Again, before his departure on 11th/12th May, they suggested that at least his pass-port should be cancelled or confiscated or something done to prevent his leaving the country. However, the Finance Minister or the Transport Minister or the Home Minister or the Prime Minister turned down the proposal both for the arrest of Dr. Teja or in the alternative for blocking his departure from the country.

I charge the Government with having connived at his escape from India in the second week of May. To suggest as the Transport Minister has said that it was the Enforcement people who were opposed to his arrest is the very travesty of truth. I might add here that had the Finance Minister not come in the way, the Enforcement Directorate and the Secretary to the Finance Ministry would have ordered his arrest under Section 19B of the Foreign Exchange Regulations Act. I need not add that the Government had also adequate powers to cancel or confiscate Dr. Teja's pass-port.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अन्त में इतना ही कहूंगा . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may read the last paragraph also and finish.

श्री मधु लिमाये : मैं अन्त में इतना ही कहूंगा कि एन्फोर्समेंट डाइरेक्टोरेट के पास उस वक्त ये कागजात थे, जो मैं टेबिल* पर रखता हूँ। ये इन्होंने—मिस्सुविशी शिपयार्ड ने—झुंटा रसीदे दी हैं, जिन्हें मैं आपकी खिदमत में पेश करता हूँ। ये सारी चीजें उन के पास थीं, लेकिन फिर भी आपने उनको गिरफ्तार करने कि इजाजत नहीं दी।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Minister.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of order. I submit that the Minister's statement is out of order because it is not in compliance with the Rules of Procedure. It cannot be laid on the Table of the House. Once it is laid on the Table, it becomes public. It violates the Rules of Procedure. Have you got a copy of the Minister's statement to be laid on the Table? I submit it cannot be laid.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He may read it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He cannot read it because it violates the Rules of Procedure. I may invite your attention to Rule 370. Before I come to that, I would like to refer to paragraph 4 of the statement proposed to be laid on the Table.

The Minister of Transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism (Shri Sanjiva Reddy): How can he quote from the statement before it is laid?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I will read the rule first. Rule 370 says:

"If, in answer to a question or during debate, a Minister discloses the advice or opinion given to him by any officer of the Government or by any other person

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

or authority, he shall ordinarily lay the relevant document or parts of document containing that opinion or advice, or a summary thereof on the Table."

Now I will not read from the statement itself. The statement refers to the advice given to the Minister by various authorities—the Enforcement Directorate, the Home Secretary, the Secretary in the Ministry of Finance and various officials of the Government. It says that a meeting was held in the house of the Home Minister on the 15th May where this advice was given to him not to arrest Dr. Teja. Unless he lays the views or the advice of these officers, this statement cannot be laid. The document containing the advice of the officers should be laid on the Table. This is number one.

Number two is this. Please refer to Rule 354. It violates this Rule also because towards the end of the statement, there is a reference to a member in the other House, in the Council, in the Rajya Sabha; there is a reference to what the Home Minister said in reply to certain documents sent by Shri Dahyabhai Patel to the Minister. There are two things: the documents sent by the member of the Rajya Sabha to the Minister and secondly, the speech made by the Home Minister in the Rajya Sabha. I believe that the quotation relates to the speech made by the Home Minister in the Rajya Sabha.

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: No; it is a letter.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That full letter, which is quoted, the full document, must be laid on the Table. (*Interruptions*).

An hon. Member: What is the point of order?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I can state the point of order, but I am sorry I cannot give the brains to understand it.

Therefore, when the Minister refers in the statement to the advice given

by the officers concerned, by the various authorities of the Government—so many Ministries are involved—to the Minister not to arrest Dr. Teja, unless it is accompanied by the statement containing their advice, this reference cannot be made. This is number one.

My second point is this. There are certain documents referred to in the penultimate para of the statement, and they are the documents sent by Shri Dayabhai Patel, Member of the Rajya Sabha, to the Home Minister, in reply to which he made a statement; God alone knows whether he made the statement in reply to the letter from Shri Dayabhai Patel or in a speech in the Rajya Sabha. The hon. Minister, will have to enlighten us on that. If it is a letter to Shri Dayabhai Patel, I do not know whether it can be referred to in this House.

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: How can I clarify unless you permit me to make the statement?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Rule 354 is very clear and it says:

"No speech made in the Council shall be quoted in the House..."

If it is not a speech made in the Rajya Sabha but a letter written to a Member of the Rajya Sabha in reply to certain documents, then also the documents must come before the House. The full text of the letter and also the advice given by the officers concerned to the Ministers or to the Government not to arrest Dr. Teja must also come before the House along with those documents; those documents must be laid on the Table of the House. Only then can the statement be laid on the Table.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to submit . . .

श्री शिवनारायण (बांसी) : प्वाइन्ट
ऑफ़ ऑर्डर बताइए ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly control him. Otherwise, I shall control him . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let the hon. Member state his point.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He has referred to rule 370. If you kindly go through the statement, you will find that this is what it says:

"The facts relating to the discussion between the Enforcement Division of the Ministry of Finance, the Secretary in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) and the Director of the Central Bureau of Investigation were not brought to the notice of the Ministry of Transport and Aviation."

My point is that here in this particular reply two Ministries have been involved; one is the Finance Ministry and the other is the Ministry of Home Affairs. For, by whom was the advice given? It was given by the CBI or the Central Bureau of Investigation; and the other advice was given by the Enforcement Directorate, which the hon. Minister is now going to correct and substitute by CBI. The Enforcement Directorate told the Aviation Department that there were enough allegations or enough charges against Dr. Teja which might warrant his arrest.

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: Before I read out the statement, hon. Members are quoting from it. I do not know how it is relevant. Please permit me to read out that statement, and afterwards, they can quote from it . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It has been laid on the Table of the House and we have got copies of it.

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: It has not been laid on the Table of the House yet.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: May I say that I got this statement from the Notice Office? My point is that the necessary advice was given by the

Ministry of Home Affairs and also by the Enforcement Directorate under the Finance Ministry. But according to the statement we find that because this advice was not made known to the Ministry or it was not discussed and was not known to the Ministry, therefore, they could not possibly justify the arrest of Dr. Teja.

The point of order raised by Shri Kamath is this that it should be supported by all the documents, and the documents should be laid on the Table of the House. May I invite your kind attention in this connection to a similar case earlier? When Shri Kamath read out certain parts from the CBI report, the non-official CBI report, Shri Sinhasan Singh raised a point of order immediately.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member is taking up the time of the House. He should be very brief.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This is not wasting time. From tomorrow you will be free and we shall be free. So, let us say what we want to say on this last day of the session, in the interests of the country. There may be thousands of Dr. Tejas, but we should not be afraid of them. At that time, Shri Sinhasan Singh raised a point of order . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: What is the hon. Member's point of order? That is what I want to know.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Shri Kamath has said that the documents should be laid on the Table of the House. My point of order is this. I also support Shri Kamath. At the same time, I would also submit that the reply should come from the Home Minister and from the Finance Minister and not the Minister in charge of Aviation, because this relates to the question of the arrest of Dr. Teja.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Rule 370 refers to answer to a question or during debate. This statement is neither in reply to a question nor a statement during a debate. This statement is under Direction 115, which clearly

says that the Member may make a statement and then the Minister will make another statement. That is all.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: But the other rules apply. Will not the other rules apply?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no point of order. The hon. Minister may make the statement.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is a wonderful ruling that you have given.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Madhu Limaye seems to be anxious that the statement should be read out. So, the hon. Minister may please read it out, or if he likes, he may place it on the Table of the House. You may lay it on the Table.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav (Barabanki): That cannot be done under the Direction.

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: I am grateful to the Honourable Speaker for giving me this opportunity to clarify a statement made by me in the course of the debate on the Jayanti Shipping Company (Taking over of Management) Bill on the 25th August, 1966.

In reply to a question then by Shri Madhu Limaye, I had referred to a meeting at the Home Minister's house on the 15th May, 1966 and had stated that the Enforcement people had advised the Government of India to wait till sufficient evidence had been gathered against Dr. Teja before ordering his arrest. I had also explained earlier on in the debate that I had not been present at this meeting and consequent on the debate, I further looked into the matter and wrote to the Honourable Speaker to permit me to make a statement.

At the very outset, before I narrate the facts of this case, I would like to make it clear that during the discussion on 25th August, 1966 when I referred to "Enforcement people" I meant the Central Bureau of Investi-

gation which is under the administrative control of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

श्री मधु लिमये : गिरफ्तारी के प्रपोजल का भी जवाब दिजिये ।

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: I am prepared to answer anything that you want. If the Chair permits, I have absolutely no objection.

I understand that the Director of the Enforcement Division in the Ministry of Finance had on the 11th May, 1966 reported to the Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) that they had information that Dr. Teja was likely to leave India on the night of the 11th/12th May, 1966. The Secretary in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) consulted the Director of the Central Bureau of Investigation who is under the administrative control of the Ministry of Home Affairs on the same day to ascertain if anything could be done to arrest Dr. Teja. The Director of the Central Bureau of Investigation explained to the Secretary concerned that the material available then was not sufficient to justify the initiation of criminal proceedings and that in the circumstances it was not possible to arrest Dr. Teja. The facts relating to the discussion between the Enforcement Division of the Ministry of Finance, the Secretary in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) and the Director of the Central Bureau of Investigation were not brought to the notice of the Ministry of Transport & Aviation.

A meeting was held subsequently in the house of Home Minister on 15th May, 1966 where the Director of the Central Bureau of Investigation confirmed his earlier view that the material available at that was not sufficient to register a criminal case and to arrest Dr. Teja.

It is the result of this meeting in the Home Minister's house that I re-

[Shri Sanjiva Reddy]

ferred to in my reply to Shri Madhu Limaye on the 25th August, 1966 (Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: What steps have been taken now to arrest him?) The reference to the Enforcement people in my reply to the Honourable Member on the 25th August, 1966 is therefore, to the Central Bureau of Investigation which is under the administrative control of the Ministry of Home Affairs, and not to the Enforcement Division which is under the administrative control of the Ministry of Finance. As soon as I became aware of these details I felt it was my duty to clarify the position to the Honourable Members.

On 19th May, 1966 the Home Minister replied to Shri Dayabhai Patel's letter of 7th May 1966 and observed, as follows, with reference to the documents sent by Shri Patel to the Home Minister:

"These documents have been carefully analysed but it appears that on the basis of the material contained in them, it is not possible to initiate criminal proceedings. The matter will have to be further probed and I am accordingly sending these papers to the Ministry of Transport for transmitting them to the Sukhthankar Committee which is already examining certain allegations against the Company. If in the course of the enquiry further material becomes available, investigation will be taken up. We are also sending copies to the Company Law Board, Ministry of Law and the Foreign Exchange Enforcement Directorate of the Ministry of Finance for examination of the matter from their respective angles.

As the Committee of Enquiry appointed by Government was not making any headway because of the non co-operative attitude of Dr. Teja and his staff, Government had to consider urgent action to progress the matter further. The Cabinet, therefore, decided to take over the management of

the Company on 9th June 1966 and an ordinance was accordingly passed on 10th June 1966 taking physical possession of the management of the Company by appointing a Board of Control as well as the Shipping Corporation of India as the Managing Agents of the Jayanti Shipping Company. The month that followed the taking over the Management resulted in detection of several documents and facts which gave sufficient material to justify initiation of criminal proceedings against Dr Teja and criminal cases have been registered against him under Section 120 B, read with Sections 409, 467 and 477A of the Indian Penal Code. Ever since the taking over of the management of the Company by Government on the 10th June, 1966, Dr. Teja has not returned to India.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, with regard to the ruling, you gave on rule 370. you in your wisdom held that it was not a debate and that rule does not apply.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No discussion on my ruling. I am not discussing it now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I am not discussing it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I may be wrong; I am not infallible. Let us not discuss it now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: How can it be?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Whether it applies or not—let us not discuss it now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If it is an arbitrary ruling, if it is against our rules?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Even if it is wrong, we have to follow it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You have to listen to what I have got to say.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When the matter comes up again, we will see not now.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is about the expunction of words; please bear with me for a minute. Under rule 380, if the Speaker is of opinion that words have been used in a debate which are defamatory or indecent or unparliamentary or undignified he may, in his discretion, order that such words be expunged from the proceedings of the House. That means during the question hour, we can use....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is a different rule altogether.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Please see the Lok Sabha debates part I and part II, the word "debate" there too.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You are getting mentally fatigued because you have been too long in the Chair today; you have brain fag... (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : उस का कारण है ।
अफ़सोस प्रकट करना चाहिये आप को ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Before I take up the next question, I am sorry to inform this position. Mr. Limaye gave a definite assurance to the office that he would not read the statement in the House. It is on that assurance the second item No. 115 was admitted and he was permitted to read his statement.

श्री मधु लिमये : ऐसा नियम नहीं है ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: But this cannot go on hereafter. Office will take note that not more than one will be admitted.

1638(Aj) LSD—7.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barackpore): How can you change the rules like this?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If an hon. Member goes back on his word.... (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : आपको आश्वासन मांगने का नियमों के अन्दर कोई अधिकार नहीं है ।

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): You cannot change the rule arbitrarily just because he did something wrong.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: You cannot give such instructions. (*Interruptions*).

श्री रामसेवक यादव : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय आप एक मिनट मेरा निवेदन सुन लें ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Bills to be introduced.

श्री राम सेवक यादव : मेरा प्रश्न दूसरा है, उस को आप सुन लीजिये । मैं आप का ध्यान खीचना चाहता हूँ कि 5 सितम्बर को श्री दाजी ने वर्मा से आने वाले चावल का सवाल उठाया था जिस को डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने दस दिन पहले यहाँ रक्खा था । अध्यक्ष महोदय ने आश्वासन दिया था कि वह उसे को देखेंगे । सन 1962 में हजारों रुपयों का नुकसान हुआ है । श्री पाटिल उस समय खाद्य मंत्री थे । इस के बारे में आप सदस्यों से पूछ सकते हैं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is a different matter altogether. How can you go on interrupting the proceedings of the House. Please sit down. Without notice you cannot raise it now. I am not hearing any persons now. The Home Minister.. (*Interruptions*).