The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): (a) It is incorrect to state that there is a spectre of starvation, disease and despair in the flood affected villages of Delhi.

(b) A number of boats have been employed for evacuation of human beings and cattle from food affected areas. Seven relief centres are operating for the purpose of distributing articles of relief, including Sirkies, bamboos, parched gram, Gur, wheat flour, 'dal' and salt. Lighting, water and medical arrangements have also been made.

(c) The relief measures were not delayed and meagre.

(d) No.

12.20 hrs.

RE: QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST THE HOME MINISTER

Mr. Speaker: Question of privilege by Shri Madhu Limaye against the Minister of Home Affairs.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): Have you permitted it?

Mr. Speaker: I am just now coming to that. I have received this notice from Mr. Madhu Limaye and 21 others. From the notice they have given me I find that the allegation is that the Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs had given that information which was published in the *Statesman*, and while that, according to their allegation, is a fact, even then the Home Minister made this statement in the House that no source from the Home Ministry had given that information to be published.

Here there are two questions that arise. One is whether the Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs had passed on that information. That would be a separate question. Here the question, is, even conceding that a Minister had passed on the information, whether the Home Minister at that time had any knowledge that the Minister in the Home Ministry had passed on that information. and with that knowledge then gave a statement contrary to those facts.

One thing is that he had that information. the other is that he ought to have that information. That would be a different thing, that might be dealt with separately. Members can urge that there was no collaboration, no consultation, there was lapse, whatever it might be, that would be a different thing that the Home Minister ought to have that information that the Minister had done it.

Now, the clear question so far as breach of privilege is concerned is whether the Home Minister definitely had that information that the Miniseter in the Ministry of Home Affairs had passed on that information to the press, and then, even with that knowledge, he misled the House. So, I will ask one Member....

श्री मधु लिमये (मुगेर) : मेरा निवेदन आज बहुत छोटा रहेगा...

Shri Tyagi: On a point of order. I beg to submit that a privilege motion shall be always in order if it is based on some specific information with regard to a matter. In this case the Home Minister has not committed himself one way or the other in the sense whether it was passed on either by the Home Ministry or some Minister in the Home Ministry to the press; that question has not been made clear. I would, therefore, request that the procedure should be that the hon. Members who have some information might table it as a question, ask for a reply; if the reply is contradictory of the previous reply, or in supplementaries there is some contradiction of what the House knows, then they would be justified to give a notice of privilege motion. Then, the first thing would be to elicit information, so that the House may know exactly what the position is. Then alone you might decide whether it is a matter of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: If I follow that procedure, that would not be a matter of recent occurrence, and the notice would lapse simply on that account, the notice would not be valid. Therefore, I cannot follow that.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): I have a point of order.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): Should you not ask first of all the Minister whether he had information whether this happened when he made the statement?

श्री मधु लिमये : उनको बाद में खुलासा करने को कहें। पहले क्यों कहते हैं? पहले मुझे तो अपनी बात कह लेने दीजिये।

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: My point of order arises out of this that under the common law of the land, if in a court of law any charge is levelled which subsequently is proved false, the leveller of the charge is open to further prosecution for having levelled such a frivolous charge. If this august House finds that a number of privilege motions, a series of privilege motions brought before the House have proved to be frivolous motions, would it not itself constitute a breach of the privilege of the House? (*Interruptions*). I want your ruling on this.

Mr. Speaker: Let this be decided first.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा निवेदन आज बहुत छोटा है। आज मैं नियम सख्या 222 के अन्दर गृह मंत्री जी के खिलाफ विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न उठाना चाहता हूं। असल में मुझे कहना चाहिये गृह मंत्रियों के खिलाफ क्योंकि मेरा प्रस्ताव न केवल श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा के खिलाफ है बल्कि राज्य मंत्री श्री जयसुखलाल हाथी और उपमंत्री श्री विद्याचरण शुक्ल के खिलाफ भी है। आपको याद होगा——(इंटरप्शंज) मंत्री की व्याख्या में सभी आ जाते हैं। गृह मंत्री तो हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तो वही रहे, बाकियों के खिलाफ आप कैसे कह सकते हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री में सब आते हैं। नियम दो को आप देख लें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रिविलेज मोशन का जहां तक ताल्लुक है, वह स्पेसिफिकेली एक आदमी के खिलाफ है। आपने कहा है कि एक के खिलाफ आप नोटिस दे रहे हैं। इस लिये वह चीज़ नहीं हो सकती है।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप उस पर निर्णय देने वाले हैं। मैं कहां देने वाला हूं।

Shri Tyagi: Have you ascertained? Have you assured yourself that the facts are there? Have you asked the Home Minister to explain to you as to what the facts are?.....(*Interruptions*).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बाद में करेंगे।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी (हमीरपुर) : बाद में नहीं, पहले होना चाहिये। जब तक सही बात न पता चले तब तक यह कैसे हो सकता है?

श्री राज नारायण (झांसी) : हम लोगों को भी सुन लिया जाए, अध्यक्ष महोदय।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आपके निर्णय के अनुसार बोलना चाहता हूं। आप अपना निर्णय दे चुके हैं।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद (भागलपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने इसी सदन में यह निर्णय दिया है अभी तीन चार दिन पहले कि चूंकि सदन मे प्रिविलेज मोशन को उठाने का जो अधिकार है उसका दुरुपयोग हो रहा है इसलिये इस सदन में किसी प्रिविलेज के प्रस्ताव को आने देने के पहले मैं उस को अपने कक्ष में देखूंगा। मैं जानना चाहता हूं

[श्री भागवत झा आजाद]

कि क्या आप ने इस सम्बन्ध में इस प्रस्ताव को अपने कक्ष में देख लिया है और देखने के बाद आपने अपनी स्वीकृति प्रदान कर दी है इसको यहां उठाने की ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने अपनी सम्मति इस बात में नहीं दे दी है। यह बात पहले चली आ रही है। यह मामला पहले से चला आ रहा है। इसलिये मैं उनको सुनना चाहता हूं।

श्री त्यागी : हाउस भी तो है।

Why waste our time here?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बन्द नहीं कर सकता हूं। किसी वक्त अपने आपको सेटिसफाई करने के लिय और यह देखने के लिए कि आया मैं इसको कंसेंट दूं या न दूं मुझे.....

Shri Tyagi: The House has wasted enough time on privilege motions; we have done no business in this session.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : यह युक्ति संगत नहीं है।

श्री म० ला० द्विवेदी : क्या जरूरत है इसकी

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सब मेम्बर बोलने लग जायगे तो कैसे काम चलेगा।

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): I can shout more than any of you. They should be sent out, Sir. Ten of them are standing simultaneously.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking the Members to be patient. I have sometimes this doubt; sometimes I have to satisfy myself; that cannot be ruled out every time that I would not bring in any motion here. I have decided some in my Chamber......(*Interruptions*).

Shri Tyagi: We shall see it through; we shall see that the proceedings are done in a proper order.

Shri Umanath: Go, go. We have gone before.

12.28 hrs.

(*Shri Tyagi and a few other Members left the House*).

The Minister of Railways (Shri S. K. Patil): Sir, I have to make a submission—

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर मंत्री महोदय का कोई पायंट आफ आर्डर है, तब वह बोल सकते हैं, अन्यथा नहीं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें।

Shri S. K. Patil: May I make a submission, Sir? I can quite understand that you gave some kind of a decision, but it is likely that you may have a doubt that the Member might be possessing some information which is not known to you. I can quite understand that. But if this method is adopted, that such an information should be sprung as a surprise on the House, and there should be this kind of debate going on, may you not consider, in your discretion, that in cases like this where some information which was not hitherto known to you has got to be divulged, that Member should be given an opportunity, not in the House to spring a surprise on everybody, to bring in any evidence that there is basis for such a thing. Otherwise, what I am afraid of is that in all these matters, a Member may claim a privilege as he has some knowledge, some information which he wants to spring as a surprise, which he has not divulged to you, which he has not divulged to the Minister concerned but he is now having it here.

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय को यह कैसे मालूम हो गया ?

Shri S. K. Patil: It will be a wrong precedent. I humbly appeal to you, not that I am against your discretion; you have got the discretion; I appeal to you that you should satisfy yourself if same information is there—

श्री मधु लिमये : व्हाट सरप्राइज़ ? कोई सरप्राइज नहीं है । यह पुरानी बात है । मंत्री महोदय गलतबयानी कर रहे हैं । मै अध्यक्ष महोदय की अनुमति से यह प्रस्ताव रख रहा हूं ।

Shri S. K. Patil: I am not going to listen to him. I am addressing the Speaker, and I shall not sit down unless you ask me to sit. Surely I am not going to be cowed down by anybody.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या यह पायंट आफ़ आर्डर पर बोल रहे हैं ? इस बारे में मेरा पायंट आफ़ आर्डर है ।

Shri S. K. Patil: I should have my say. Therefore, my appeal to you is that there is no cause for excitement on either side. I appeal to you that you may lay down some kind of a procedure that will put a stop to all this wrangling going on every day and wasting the useful time of this House.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): Sir, I feel that while there cannot be a blanket ban on privilege motions being raised in this House, you might address yourself to this vary crucial, basic problem: if a matter is sought to be raised here, whether it contains something which may be, either expressly or impliedly, defamatory of a Member of the House, and whether or not you require that some basis should be laid down before it is relayed to this House. We have had cases which were *ex facie* grossly defamatory and which were brought to this House. Now, we are in the exercise of finding out whether there is a semblance of a basis. If such a matter is raised, what happens? This has become an instrument, maybe unwittingly, perhaps even wittingly, for relaying to this House grossly defamatory and baseless allegations against another Member. That is very important.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फ़रुखाबाद) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब आप सब सदस्यों को सुन रहे हैं, तो आप मुझे भी सुन लीजिए । मेरा भी व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

Shri A. P. Sharma (Buxar): I rose several times to raise a point of order, on the same point on which Shri Madhu Limaye rose.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I had said that this right of raising breach of privilege questions is being abused, misused—

Shri Madhu Limaye: By whom?

Mr. Speaker: By the Members here.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं अपने बारे में कह सकता हूं कि मैं ने इस अधिकार को एब्यूज़ नहीं किया है ।

Mr. Speaker: It is being abused and misused. I repeat it.

श्री बागड़ी (हिसार) : मैम्बरों को जो अधिकार प्राप्त हैं, अगर वे उस को इस्तेमाल करते हैं, तो आप उस को गलत इस्तेमाल नहीं कह सकते हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. They will be making fun of this breach of privilege matters if they raise them like this. (*Interruption*).

श्री बागड़ी : यह मिसयूज़ नहीं है ।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He cannot speak in that manner.

श्री बागड़ी : आप का आर्डर इधर तो नहीं चलता है ।

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): We are sorry that you are making such a sweeping statement that Members have abused and misused this privilege. We are very

[Shri Vasudevan Nair]

sorry to hear you making such a sweeping remark about the Members.

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह आप ने बहुत बुरा किया है। आप ने सदन पर आरोप लगाया है ।

Shri Vasudevan Nair: You will please remember that many of the motions which were raised were sent to the Privileges Committee.

Some Hon. Members: All motions.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: At least you were convinced, if not the other Members on the other side, that there was a *prima facie* case for those matters to be sent to the Privileges Committee. You will realise that there are Members in this House who are very vigilant and bring up such matters. You should not find fault with those members who are doing that.

Mr. Speaker: If I have referred some matters to the Privileges Committee, certainly I would have done that even if I had the opportunity of looking into them in my chamber when there is a *prima facie* case. When there is a *prima focie* case, certainly I will bring it before the House.

I would appeal to the Members on this side that they cannot just preclude me from bringing a notice here before the House where I feel that there is something to be found out from the members. I will put two questions. It might be an interpretation on behalf of the member, that he puts that construction on the facts that he has stated in the notice or he has some special knowledge. Let me see what he does. Then alone I can arrive at a conclusion. This matter is already pending before the House; it is not a new thing that has been brought.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, "मंत्री" शब्द की व्याख्या के बारे में मैं आप का निर्णय मानूंगा । आप एतराज क्यों कर रहे हैं? मैं आप का निर्णय मानूंगा ।

Mr. Speaker: The office of the Speaker has become a football to be kicked this way or that way. I am threatened and intimidated. I have framed these questions and he may kindly address himself to those questions. That is what I am asking.

मुझे टन किया जाता है और मुझे इन्टिमिडेटिंग टीन में एड्रेस किया जाता है । एक मैम्बर की दूसरे मैम्बर के प्रति जो आर्डिनरी कर्टसी होनी चाहिये, वह भी नहीं दिखाई जाती है । मुझे इस तरह एड्रेस किया जाता है, जैसे मुझे कोअर्स करने की कोशिश की जा रही हो ।

Shri Daji (Indore): He says he is accepting your ruling.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ख्वामख्वाह एतराज कर रहे हैं । मैं ने आप का निर्णय मान लिया है ।

आप को याद होगा कि 10 अगस्त के स्टेटसमैन में एक खबर छपी थी कि वामपंथी कम्युनिस्टों के द्वारा देश में तोड़फोड़ करवाने का व्यापक षडयन्त्र रचे जाने के सम्बन्ध में गृह मंत्रालय से समाचार प्राप्त हुए हैं । मैं स्टेटसमैन की रिपट के कुछ अंश आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूं । मैं रपट बिल्कुल नहीं पढ़ूंगा । उस में पांच जगह गृह मंत्रालय का जो उल्लेख आया है, मैं वह शब्दावली पढ़ता हूं :

"Presumably on the basis of..

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं माननीय सदस्य से फिर विनती करूंगा कि मैं ने जो दो सवाल रखे हैं, वह उन के बारे में कहें ।

श्री मधु लिमये : उस समाचार में पांच जगह गृह मंत्रालय का उल्लेख आया है। मैं उस की शब्दावली पढ़ना चाहता हूं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पांच जगह हो या दस जगह हो, मान लें कि वह दुरुस्त हैं, वह सब कुछ दुरुस्त है, लेकिन उन शब्दों को मान कर. . .

श्री मधु लिमये : ठीक है। मैं आगे बढ़ रहा हूं।

यह मामला श्री गोपाल द्वारा सदन में उठाया गया था और उस वक्त नन्दा साहब ने इस बात से साफ़ इन्कार किया कि गृह-मंत्रालय से सम्बन्धित किसी भी व्यक्ति के द्वारा यह समाचार प्रसारित किया गया है। मुझे इस बात का भी पता चला है कि गृह मंत्रालय ने इस समाचार का खंडन **स्टेटसमैन** के सम्पादक के पास भेजा था। उन्होंने यह छापना भी स्वीकार किया था, मगर उन्होंने यह शर्त लगाई थी कि गृह मंत्रालय के पत्र के नीचे वे अपनी ओर से ये वाक्य छापेंगे कि उस खंडन के बावजूद हमारे विशेष संवाददाता अपनी भूमिका पर डटे हुए हैं। जब **स्टेटसमैन** के सम्पादक से गृह मंत्री ने सुना, तब गृह मंत्री ने इस खंडन के छपने के बारे में अपना आग्रह छोड़ दिया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, लोक सभा में यह बहस होने के पश्चात **टाइम्स आफ इंडिया** गुट के नये और मशहूर साप्ताहिक पत्र **दिनमान** ने अपने 19 अगस्त के अंक में एक छोटी सी खबर छापी है, जो इस प्रकार है—उस पत्र के एक कालम "कानोंकान" में यह कहा गया है :

> "आखिर यह समाचार गृह मंत्रालय के किस अधिकारी ने दिल्ली के एक समाचार पत्र को दिया कि वामपंथी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने देश भर में व्यवस्था को तहस-नहस करने की योजना बनाई है। लोक सभा में श्री नन्दा ने इस बात से इनकार किया कि यह खबर गृह मंत्रालय के किसी अधिकारी ने दी। जानकारों का यह दावा है कि यह समाचार गृह मंत्रालय में ही पैदा हुआ था, लेकिन यह उक्त समाचार पत्र को किसी अधिकारी ने नहीं बल्कि गृह मंत्रालय के एक मंत्री ने दिया है।"

चूं कि इस में एक मंत्री का उल्लेख है इस लिए जो तीन चार मंत्री हैं, उन का नाम मैं नहीं ले रहा हूं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अच्छी बात है।

श्री मधु लिमये : तो उन्होंने कहा है कि गृह मंत्रालय के एक मंत्री ने यह खबर दी है। अब एक मंत्री से उन का क्या मतलब है यह मैं नहीं जान सकता। शायद इस शब्दावली से वह यह सूचित करना चाहते हैं कि यह समाचार देने वाले मंत्री स्वयं गुलजारी लाल नन्दा नहीं थे बल्कि दूसरे दो में से थे। इसका साफ अर्थ हुआ कि या तो यह समाचार उन मंत्री ने या राज्य मंत्री ने दिये हैं। मैं नाम नहीं लेता। इस के पीछे क्या सत्य है यह ढूंढ निकालने के लिए मेरा विशेषाधिकार का प्रस्ताव समिति के पास जाना चाहिये। समिति **"स्टेटसमैन"** और "दिनमान" के सम्पादकों को बुलाये। उन से पूछे कि सत्य क्या है। क्या सचमुच उन्हें खबर गृह मंत्रालय से प्राप्त हुई है ?

मुझे इस बात पर बड़ा अफ़सोस है कि गृह मंत्रालय, उन के पास जो शक्ति है, उन का जो अखबार वालों पर प्रभाव है, उस का इस्तेमाल करके एक विरोधी दल को और उन के सदस्यों को बिला वजह और बिल्कुल निराधार ढंग से बदनाम करने की कोशिश करता है। **स्टेटसमैन** और **टाइम्स आफ इंडिया** गुट कोई मामूली गुट नहीं है। समाचार पत्रों के जगत में इन का बहुत ऊंचा स्थान है। जब दोनों बहुत जोर के साथ, वजन के

[श्री मधु लिमये]

साथ कहते हैं कि समाचार गृह मंत्रालय से ही प्राप्त हुए हैं तो लोक-सभा को इस बात का गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करना चाहिये। जिस तरह हमारी जिम्मेदारियां है और हमारे अधिकार हैं, उसी तरह अखबार वालों को भी अपनी स्वतंत्रता है, उनके अपने बुनियादी अधिकार हैं। जिस तरह उन को अपने अधिकारों का संयमित ढंग से इस्तेमाल करना चाहिये उसी तरह हमारे जो मंत्री लोग हैं उन को भी सब काम बहुत सोच-समझ कर करना चाहिये। बात बिलकुल साफ़ है कि इस में किसी न किसी का दोष है। या तो गृह-मंत्रालय का है या अखबार वालों का है। मेरा अपना अनुमान है कि इस में दोष गृह-मंत्रालय का ही है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरे सवालों का जवाब तो आना चाहिए.......

श्री मधु लिमये : वह आ रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने जो सवाल पूछे हैं, उन का जवाब दीजिए। इस को छोड़ दीजिए। मेरे प्रश्नों का जवाब नहीं आ रहा है।

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रश्नों का जवाब देने के लिए ही यह है। मैं खत्म कर रहा हूं। दो चार वाक्य और रह गए हैं। आप के प्रश्न का जवाब अब आता है।

तो उन के दूसरे सहयोगियों द्वारा जो काम किये जाते हैं उन का नन्दा साहब को पता नहीं रहता है लेकिन पता लगाने के पहले वह समाचारों का खंडन सदन में कर डालते हैं, अखबार वालों को दोषी ठहराते हैं, यह चीज़ भी अच्छी नहीं है। इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि यह मामला विशेष अधिकार समिति के पास जाय।

फिर मैं पूरे जोर के साथ कहूंगा कि इस मामले में दलीय राजनीति को हम घसीट के न लाये। पाटिल साहब के लिए कह रहा हूं। यह गृह मंत्रालय बनाम पूरे सदन का मामला है। या तो मंत्री दोषी है या अखबार वालों से कोई भूल हुई है। इस का फैसला तो समिति ही कर सकती है।

Shri Umanath: Sir, I wish to submit only one thing. I have given the second motion on this. I will take only a minute or two. I want to bring to your notice and, through you, to the notice of this House, a fact which will confirm the position and give a reply to your question, whether the Home Minister was aware of it on the 11th when he made the statement. I am confining my remarks only with regard to that.

I do not want to repeat what Shri Limaye has said about the facts, that the Home Ministry, the other day, on the 11th, when the Minister made that statement here, had sent a communication to the *Statesman* denying that Home Ministry was the source. That was admitted here itself. The Home Ministry wanted the editor to publish that and the editor, as he said, called the particular correspondent and told him that they were going to publish it because the Home Ministry were asking him to publish their communication. I am not talking with regard to the publication of the denial of the allegation against our party on merits; we do not want Shri Nanda's assistance for that, we have our own strength, but I am talking of their communication. Then the correspondent, according to my information, told the editor that he could publish the Home Ministry's communication provided he added a note that "Our correspondent maintains his previous position with regard to the publication on the 10th." I just now come to the point. When that information was conveyed to the Home Ministry, then, instead of insisting on their original advice to publish, the Home Ministry said:

"publish neither our communication nor your correspondent's contention". I am confirming this by a subsequent instance. On the 11th, after Shri Nanda's statement, Shri A. K. Gopalan, the Leader of our Group, wrote a letter to the Editor, *Statesman*, where he quoted Shri Nanda's denial with rtgard to Home Ministry being the source. After quoting Shri Nanda's statement—I am not reading that portion—finally, that letter told the Editor, Statesman:

> "We have no desire to be personally vindicative or malicious, howsoever strong the provocation in the allegations might be, but public standards and responsible journalism demand that in fairness to us, you publish this letter in full in your paper and issue a suitable contradiction to set the record right."

This was written after quoting Shri Nanda's denial here. To that, the Editor replied to Shri A. K. Gopalan over the telephone when I was present—the Editor said it clearly—that he will rather go to jail than let down the truth and the truth is, he said, "as far as we are concerned, he got it from the Home Ministry." He said that he cannot utter a falsehood because the country will get a false impression; so, he said, he will never let down the truth. A subsequent letter was sent and the Editor agreed to publish at least "we are sorry for the misunderstanding", but not the denial. Later, even that was not included because the Calcutta Editor said "even if we publish that we regret for the misunderstanding, the country will misunderstand that the source was not the Home Ministry; so, we are not prepared to publish even that". That is the secret why Shri Nanda or the Home Ministry officials, who told the paper first to publish the communication later retracted. So, he was aware of the truth when he made the statement and he has made an untruthful statement.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Nanda): I find now that this question of privilege, as you have clarified, is raised on the assumption that what I said here was not correct and that I knew that it was not true when I made the statement. I can say with all the emphasis at my command and the deepest earnestness and sincerity before this august House that when I made that statement. on that occasion I knew that it was correct. and I made it without any kind of reservation in my mind that it was not correct; it was true, to my knowledge. I further maintain now that I am prepared to to reiterate it here. I stand by it. What I said then was correct then, it is correct now, to the best of my knowledge and I have no reason to disbelieve whatever I had said then.

One or two other points have been raised, and I would like to meet them. On the 10th, immediately after the Calling Attention Notice was given, I received my Information Officer and made him write to the *Statesman* that it is not true, that it has not emanated from the Home Ministry. On the 12th we received a reply from the Editor saying:

> "In any case we have today published the Home Minister's speech in Parliament. We are not, therefore, publishing your letter as desired. If you think it necessary to do so, we will...."

(*Interruptions*).

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Read it further.

Shri Nanda: I am prepared to read it.

> "....we will supplement it by giving a separate account...."

Shri S. M. Banerjee: What is that? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Nanda: I am prepared to read it fully. This letter is dated the 12th. Before that, on the 11th, this discus-

[Shri Nanda]

sion had taken place. This was a letter from the Information Officer. I, as a Minister, had made that statement. That statement had been published in the *Statesman.*

Now, my purpose had been served, my statement had been published, the contradiction had been published in the *Statesman*, it was not material for me that anything more was publisherd. That paper had committed an indiscretion before. I did not want to be a party to its committing another indiscretion by bringing in, dragging in, another name, of this Minister or that Minister. Why should I? If it had to serve any of their purposes, I did not want to hold their hands. It was not necessary that the letter should be published, my contradiction should be published. But if it was necessary for them to somehow vindicate their position, who stopped them from doing it? They could have done it anyhow. For the hon. Member to go on making general, wild, sweeping statements that my colleagues, the Ministers—he mentioned Shri Hathi and Shri Shukla—do things without my knowing it and that I make them do certain things....

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने यह नहीं कहा, मैंने धीरे धीरे बयान पढ़ा है, बहुत सौम्य शब्दों में मैंने कहा है ।

Shri Nanda: That is not true at all.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने ऐसा नहीं कहा है ।

Shri Nanda: When I made that statement, I will just now add, I had shown it to everybody concerned in my Ministry, including Shri Shukla, Shri Hathi and everybody. Then, again, I questioned closely everybody. Therefore I was quite satisfied that what I was saying was correct.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : व्यवस्था कैसे हो सकती है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप सब की सुनते हैं, न जाने क्यों मेरे ऊपर आपकी कुदृष्टि है । मैं विशेषाधिकार के सम्बन्ध में कहना चाहता हूं, नंदा जी से इसका कोई मतलब नहीं है, विशेषाधिकार से इस का मतलब है ।

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raniganj): What is the point of order in this?

Mr. Speaker: Instead of fighting, let him finish.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आखिर विशेषाधिकार का आधार इसी बात पर होता है कि इस माननीय सदन को और आपको गलती में और झूठ में फर्क करने के लिए कोई बुनियाद चाहिए । क्या गलती है, क्या असत्य है, और अगर कोई आदमी खाली खुद जोर से अपनी अन्तरआत्मा की गवाही दे कर बोल दे कि मैंने असत्य नहीं कहा था, मुझ से गलती हो गई थी, तो उसको मान लेना बहुत ही गलत काम होगा । यहां पर कुछ न कुछ कसौटियां होनी चाहिए कि जिनसे गलती का असत्य माना जाय । मुझे यह साफ तौर से कहना है कि कई बार मंत्री लोग असत्य कह देने पर भी मक गलती की संज्ञा दे दिया करते हैं । इस लिये गलती और असत्य के बारे में जरूर कोई न कोई कसौटी बताइये । मैं एक चीज और निवेदन करना चाहता हूं . . . (व्यवधान)

यहां पर विशेषाधिकार के जितने भी मामले आते हैं, उसमें से कई स्वीकार कर लिये जाते हैं, लेकिन इस सदन को अभिमान

होगा जिस दिन एक मंत्री के खिलाफ भी विशेषाधिकार माना जायगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : चूंकि मंत्री के बरखिलाफ आज तक कोई नहीं माना गया, इसलिए कोई न कोई मंत्री के खिलाफ मन्जूर कर लो, यह कोई दलील नहीं है । (**व्यवधान**) Order, order. I have already made it clear what conditions should determine so far as the decision on this issue is concerned.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह तो कभी दुनियां में हो नहीं सकता ।

Mr. Speaker: Even conceding that the information had passed from the Ministry of Home Affairs, even conceding that some Minister in the Home Ministry—that is all what the papers say, that some Minister in the Home Ministry—had passed on that information, even then—they might be liable for any other action —I have only to confine myself to this question alone....

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप क्या चाहते हैं कि किसी मंत्री को....

Mr. Speaker: .....whether a breach of privilege has been committed and whether I should give my consent to it. I have made it clear and I repeat that it was to be proved that not only the information leaked out from the Ministry or from any of the Ministers but that at the time of making the statement the Home Minister knew that this information had passed from the Home Ministry and then having that knowledge, with that knowledge, he made the statement different from it. That has not been proved and, therefore, I cannot give my consent.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप क्या चाहते हैं कि किसी मंत्री के खिलाफ....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने निर्णय कर लिया है, अब आप बैठ जाइये । (**व्यवधान**)

श्री मधु लिमये : इसी लिए, अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज मैं मांग करता हूं कि आप कांग्रेस पार्टी की सदस्यता से इस्तीफा दीजिये । जब तक आप कांग्रेस पार्टी नहीं छोड़ेंगे, इस सदन की शोभा और शान नहीं बनी रह सकती ।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Whether there has been any breach of privilege earlier or not, this is a breach of privilege, to cast reflection against the Speaker.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने कुछ नहीं कहा है, मैंने मांग की है ।

Mr. Speaker: These are reflections against the Speaker. I will refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges that they might consider it. That is a clear breach of privilege. There is a reflection against the Speaker. (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : मैंने क्या कहा है ।

Shri Raghunath Singh: I move a motion.....(*Interruptions*).

Shri S. K. Patil: I move that this be sent to the Committee of Privileges. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): May I make a request? The House is aware that we are sitting on the 3rd and 5th September. May I request you to direct—there may not be Question Hour on 3rd—that on Monday, the 5th, there will be Question Hour?