

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप विशेषाधिकार के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहते हैं ?

श्री मधु लिखये : मैं उसके सम्बन्ध में कुछ प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ। मैं उस पर नहीं बोल रहा हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप मुझे लिख कर भेज दीजिए कि प्राप किस बात पर बोलना चाहते हैं।

श्री मधु लिखये : छाद्य मन्त्री के सम्बन्ध में विशेषाधिकार के प्रश्न के बारे में मैंने कुछ और तथ्य इकट्ठे किये हैं। मैंने उनको प्राप के पास भेजना चाहा था, लेकिन वह समय पर नहीं हो पाया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तो इस तरह बीच में बखल देकर तो नहीं हो सकता है। अभी काफी समय है। प्राप उस को मेरे पास भेज दीजिए। प्राप इस तरह बीच में इन्टरप्ट न करें।

श्री बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे पहले इतिला थिलनी चाहिए कि प्राप क्या कहना चाहते हैं।

श्री बागड़ी : विशेषाधिकार के बारे में।

श्री मधु लिखये : प्राप हम को पढ़ कर सुना दें कि प्राप मन्त्री महोदय को क्या लिखने वाले हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने उनको लिख कर भेज दिया है।

11.44 hrs.

RULES COMMITTEE

SECOND REPORT

Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-rule (1) of rule 331 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, the Second Report of the Rules Committee.

11.44½ hrs.

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

FIFTH AND SIXTH REPORTS

Shri Krishnamoorthy Rao (Shimoga): I beg to present the Fifth and Sixth Reports of the Committee of Privileges.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): In this connection, I had given notice for a statement to be made under Rule 377.

Mr. Speaker: No member knows what it contains. Let that report be read by the members, so that they are posted with what it contains.

Shri Kapur Singh: That would be for a discussion. I am not asking for a discussion. I am asking for a statement to be made under Rule 377, for which this is the only proper occasion.

Mr. Speaker: Let the members know what the report contains.

Shri Kapur Singh: Members will not know, even after reading the report, what I have to say under Rule 377. I beg of you to permit me to make that statement.

It will not do anybody any harm.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of any harm to be done to anybody.

Shri Kapur Singh: It is absolutely necessary in the interests of...

Mr. Speaker: What does he want to say?

Shri Kapur Singh: Under rule 377, I wish to place the following matter for the information of the House.

After the draft report, which has just been presented, was considered and adopted, I filed a Minute of Dissent under

direction 90 of the Directions by the Speaker, but subsequently, the Committee, in my absence, prepared and decided to append an Annexure Note to the Report refuting my Minute of Dissent.

Thereupon, on the 28th April, I filed an Addendum, arguing that (a) the Annexure Note is incompetent as the Rules do not contemplate it, and it is, therefore, impermissible for it to be included in the Report to be presented to the House,....

Shri Parashar (Shivpuri): On a point of order...

Mr. Speaker: Let Shri Kapur Singh finish his submission. Then, I shall hear the hon. Member.

Shri Parashar: I want to raise a point of order in connection with the statement that he is making.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंघेर) : कौन से रूल के नीचे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं खुद उन से पूछ लूंगा। माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं इस सम्बन्ध में आप की मदद करना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे मदद नहीं चाहिए। मैं उनसे खुद पूछ लूंगा। माननीय सदस्य बैठ जायें।

Shri Kapur Singh:and (b) the arguments and authority cited in the Note were calculated to mislead and misdirect the House, as it was wholly inapplicable to the case under reference.

The Committee of Privileges, in my absence, at its meeting on the 29th April has decided that it (my Addendum) need not be included in the Report of the Committee.

I wish to bring to the notice of the House, that there is no provision un-

der the Rules of this House, enabling the Committee thus to 'declude' my Addendum under reference, and further, it is contrary to the requirements of fairness and good conscience to suppress that which has been legitimately sent in refutation of such actions of the Committee as are themselves ab initio contrary to the Rules of the House.

Lastly, the said decision of the Committee also amounts to gross interference with the rights and privileges of a member of their own committee.

Shri Parashar: My point of order is that the statement cannot be allowed in connection with the report which has just been presented to the House after it has been adopted by the Privileges Committee. The hon. Member should first have gone to the Privileges Committee..

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या यह पायंट प्राफ़ घाईर है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य मुझे सुनने दें।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से पूछ रहा हूँ कि क्या यह पायंट प्राफ़ घाईर है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पहले मुझे सुन लेने दीजिए।

श्री बागड़ी (हिंसार) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप हम लोगों को बतौर रूल बनाए हुए पायंट प्राफ़ घाईर उठाने की इजाजत नहीं देते हैं। लेकिन माननीय सदस्य को आप बतौर रूल बताये पायंट प्राफ़ घाईर उठाने की इजाजत दे रहे हैं। उन को पहले रूल बताना चाहिए।

Shri Parashar: The statement which has been made under rule 377 does not actually fall under that rule. That is my first submission.

[Shri Parashar]

Secondly, my submission is that the hon. Member is a member of the Privileges Committee. As long as he is a member of the Privileges Committee, he has got to approach the Privileges Committee first and raise the statement there first, and after that, he could approach the chairman for making any submissions. He has not adopted that course or taken advantage of that procedure. Now, over and above the head of the Privileges Committee, he has come before the House. This is a breach of privilege of the committee and this is an insult to the Privileges Committee. Therefore, I raise this question that the statement should not be allowed to go into the proceedings of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Any statement under rule 377 can be made with the consent of the Speaker. Shri Kapur Singh had written to me saying that he wanted to raise it. I had told him that this was not the appropriate time. But then he persisted, and, therefore, I allowed him.

This is not the correct procedure. If he had not been present in the committee, then that was not the fault of the committee and the committee could take any decision that it wanted to take and which at that time it thought proper....

Shri Kapur Singh: It cannot be any decision, but it has to be a decision under the Rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The only remedy lies by way of an appeal to the speaker saying that this has not been done. It is not the right procedure to stand up and criticise the committee in the House that they have not done this thing in a fair manner or that thing in a fair manner and so on, unless the report of the committee is brought before the House for discussion. There is no other way in which that can be criticised, and this ought not to have been done, and I quite agree in regard to that.

11:50 hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1966—contd.

Mr. Speaker: Further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri on the 29th April 1966, namely:—

“That the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1966-67, be taken into consideration”.

Shri Dandekar might continue.

Shri N. Dandekar (Gonda): Mr. Speaker, I was explaining yesterday a somewhat complicated point as regards the mode of assessing the incidence of taxation, and I would like to explain the same thing now in simpler terms.

For a country like ours, with a low level of national income and a subsistence level of income per capita, the incidence of additional burdens imposed during the Third Plan compared with the Second Plan must be assessed on the “slab system” and not on the “step system” of computation. When so considered, it will be found, firstly, that the additional drafts of all kinds on national income made by the Central and State Governments taken together, in 1965-66, the last year of the Third Plan, compared with 1960-61, the last year of the Second Plan, was 42 per cent of the additional national income in 1965-66 over 1960-61. Secondly, the additional drafts on national income by way of taxation alone made by the Central and State Governments taken together in 1965-66 compared with 1960-61 was as high as 26 per cent of the additional income in 1965-66 over 1960-61. Thirdly, since taxes are paid by human beings and not by national income, one must consider this matter by reference to per capita income rather than....

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): There is no one representing the