

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** वह तो आपको इत्तला मिल जायगी बाकी मुझे कुछ वक्त चाहिए ताकि मैं उसको देख लूं।

**श्री किशन पटनायक :** ठीक है आप देख लीजियेगा।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मुझे आगे की ओर सीट के लिए इनके नेता श्री बागड़ी दूसरी दफ़्त भी कहा था और बतलाया था कि उनका नम्बर इतना है कि उन्हें भी फ़ॉट बैंच में सीट मिलन चाहिए जैसे कि उनके ग्रुप जितने नम्बर के दूसरे ग्रुप्स के लीडर्स को मिली हुई है। मैं उनको इस बात को तसलौम करता हूँ और चूँकि उनके उतने नम्बर के ग्रुप्स लीडर्स को, बल्कि उनसे कम वाले भी फ़ॉट सीट्स पर बैठें हैं और बैठते चले आये हैं इसलिए उन्हें भी आगे की सीट मिलनी चाहिए। अब जहाँ तक मेरा ताल्लुक है मुझे ग्रुप्स के यहाँ नम्बर के लिहाज से ही इस चीज को देखना है। नम्बर के अलावा मेरे पास और टैस्ट ही क्या है क्योंकि सारे ग्रुप्स रैगुलरली रैकगनाइज्ड तो हैं नहीं इसलिए सब को एक ही बराबर समझना है इसलिए सब का हक एक बराबर बनता है और नम्बर के ही आधार पर उन्हें स्थान मुझे देना है। यँ सवाल पिछले सेशन में उठाया गया था। तब मैंने कहा था कि अब यह तो सेशन गुजर रहा है इसलिए इसको मैं अगले सेशन में देखूँगा। इस दफ़ा जब यह सेशन शुरू हुआ और उन्होंने यह मामला फिर उठाया तो मैंने फिर कहा कि मैं उनको इस बात को तसलौम करता हूँ कि नम्बर के मुताबिक उन्हें भी आगे स्थान मिलना चाहिए और मैं उसके लिए कोशिश करता रहा लेकिन इसी बीच बर्दक़रमती से कुछ अर्थों के लिए वह चले गये हाउस से और मैं भी उस पर ज़रादा ध्यान नहीं दे सका। जब फिर हाल में उन्होंने यह चीज उठाई तो मैंने उनके लिए एक नई सीट बनाई और कहा कि उनको अगली साँट दे जाय। उनको मैंने आगे रक्खा मगर उनको वह मंज़ूर नहीं

हुआ बाकी सब पार्टी वालों ने भी एतराज किया। अब चूँकि इस सेशन का अखिर है, इसे खत्म होने में बहुत थोड़े दिन रह गये हैं इसलिए हम मीज़ूदा सीटिंग अर्रेंजमेंट को अभी फिलहाल चलने दें क्योंकि सारा सीटिंग अर्रेंजमेंट हमें डिस्टर्ब करना पड़ेगा। जब सबने कहा कि अभी उसको डिस्टर्ब न किया जाय और श्री बागड़ी ने भी जब यह कहा कि हमें यह मंज़ूर नहीं है तो मैंने उसको रहने दिया। मैंने फिर लांडर अफ़्रीक दी हाउस से कहा कि आगे की एक साँट मुझे वह दे दें तो मैं उस पर श्री बागड़ी को आगे बैठा दूँ हमारे पास कोई वजह नहीं है कि मैं क्यों न उन्हें आगे की सीट पर बैठाऊँ। लेकिन उन्होंने भी मुझ से आगे का कोई सीट देने का करार नहीं किया लेकिन मैं अब भा अपना कोशिश जारी रखूँगा कि वह आगे आकर बैठें श्री बागड़ी आगे की साँट पर आ जाय और बैठे इसमें मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है क्योंकि नम्बर के मुताबिक उन्हें भी आगे जगह मिलनी चाहिए।

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrack-pore):** My point is that it is rather bad that Members have to go on asking. You yourself should do it. My feeling is that if we are going on asking you for certain rights which are their inherently...

**Mr. Speaker:** I have done that.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty:** They have to write to you again and again and still it has not been done.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have done that; that is what I say.

11.44 hrs.

#### RE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrack-pore):** Sir, I have put in a privilege motion against Shri Atulya Ghosh. I have asked you to permit me... (Interruptions). There seems to be very raucous laughter. On 18th August, 1966, Sri Atulya Ghosh rose in this House to make a statement of personal explanation, with regard to the allegations made in the previous day's half-an-hour discussion on Pakistani spies, wherein a Muslim moving under cover of

being a Hindu and calling himself by the name of Mohit Choudhuri and Shri Sunil Das, an employee of A.I.C.C. were charged with espionage on behalf of Pakistan. It was alleged that these persons were known to Shri Atulya Ghosh and it was charged that there was inordinate delay in arresting them under pressure from high-ups even after enquiries were completed at the Centre and that under similar pressure the Centre had turned over the case to West Bengal.

At the very time when Shri Atulya Ghosh rose to make the personal explanation, Shri Madhu Limaye rose to warn that no such statement should contain any controversial or untrue facts.

Naturally, if such could be proved it should be treated as a serious matter and that it should be regarded as a deliberate and calculated attempt to mislead the House.

I now rise to state that the personal explanatory statement of Shri Atulya Ghosh contains deliberate falsehoods which try to absolve him of complicity and sets him out in a light as if he refused to have anything to do with persons charged with such serious crimes. This I maintain is a deliberate distortion of truth to mislead the House and to create a wrong impression about the events that took place. The personal explanatory statement of Shri Atulya Ghosh states:

"When Sunil's house was searched, as the staff of the AICC he came and reported to me that his house was searched and I told him to take the help of a lawyer. The law of the land is to prevail."

May I point out to you, Sir, that this statement of his is a total falsehood and has no other intention than to mislead the House.

Shri Sunil Das' house was searched in the early hours of 10th August morning and he was simultaneously put under arrest. Shri Atulya Ghosh was already away from Delhi at the time. He hurried back to Delhi only on the 18th August, 1966—the

day after the matter was raised in Parliament. How then could he have met Sunil Das? How then Shri Atulya Ghosh make the deliberate statements in Parliament on the 18th August, 1966 that he had told Sunil Das that the law must take its course and that he must go to a lawyer? Either it is a deliberate falsehood made to mislead the House about the whole episode or that Shri Atulya Ghosh has such tremendous influence over the Home Ministry and its police and intelligence that even after Shri Sunil Das was arrested, he was allowed to contact Shri Atulya Ghosh to get his advice.

My contention is, the statement made by Shri Atulya Ghosh is false and is made with the object of misleading the House and distorting the truth. Shri Atulya Ghosh cast aspersion on the Members of the House that they had made these with malicious intent of maligning him personally and he even drew into his ambit the Congress organisation.

You may remember, Sir, that the charges made were serious ones affecting national security. By utilising the opportunity given for making a personal explanation, Shri Atulya Ghosh has not only made false statements but charged Members of malicious intent. The entire episode is a series of breaches of privilege and I would request you to give your consent to raise this matter as a privilege motion in this House.

I would further like to point out that Shri Atulya Ghosh has made a correction in the statement which he gave before the House. He has now made a substantive change to the effect that instead of saying that Shri Sunil Das, after his house was searched, approached him, he now says that after the warrant was issued he approached him. This again is another very serious thing.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): When was the correction made?

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: In the Reporters' copy it has been further corrected. If that is at all true—he must be making a statement just now I presume or

may be on Monday—I would request you to give us an opportunity of hearing the tape-recorder played back and see what Shri Atulya Ghosh had said and which so many in this House have heard. Furthermore, I would beg of you to ask the Home Ministry for the confessional statement made to the police, not to the court, but to the police, made voluntarily by Mohit Choudhuri. I would request you to call for a copy from the Home Ministry and see for yourself that almost all the statements which Shri Atulya Ghosh has made on the floor of this House are not truths, they are untruths and it is a clear case of breach of privilege. I would request you to send this matter to the Privileges Committee.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबई): अध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ...

Mr. Speaker: First of all, I should like to inform Shrimati Renu Chakravarty that Shri Atulya Ghosh had made that correction but we had not allowed that.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: Then it is still worse.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirapalli): When he makes a correction without even the permission of the Chair and the House, it makes matters still worse. (Interruption)

Mr. Speaker: There is nothing wrong in that. When the uncorrected record goes to a Member, he makes a correction and it comes to me to see whether a substantive change has been made by that correction or not. (Interruption). Order, Order.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ लेकिन सब से पहले एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि 18 तारीख को लाबी में श्री अनुराध घोष मुझ से मिले थे और उन्होंने कहा—यह बहुत जरूरी बात है—कि वह आज स्पष्टीकरण देने वाले हैं मैंने उन को सलाह दी कि वह एक लिखित बयान दें क्योंकि यह बड़ा गम्भीर मामला है। लेकिन उन्होंने कहा कि इस की

कोई जरूरत नहीं और वह जबानी ही बयान देंगे।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप को जो दो चार बातें इस के सम्बन्ध में कहनी हैं, वह आप कहें।

श्री मधु लिमये : अच्छा जो नई बातें हैं अब मैं आप के सामने उन को रखना चाहता हूँ।

Now I shall nail down the untruthful statements made by Shri Atulya Ghosh in his so-called personal explanation.

(a) His statement that he "never knew this Mohit Choudhuri" and "had never seen" him in his life is false. The confessional statement given by Shri Mohit Choudhuri, if laid on the Table of the House by the Prime Minister, will demonstrate the falsity of Shri Ghosh's assertion. The confessional statement should at least be shown to the Speaker to satisfy him about the truthfulness or otherwise of Shri Ghosh's statement.

(b) His statement that Shri Sunil Das was only one amongst the 105 employees in the AICC's office gives the impression that he was not an important man so far as the AICC office's set up was concerned. We would like to point out that there was a proposal to appoint this gentleman as office secretary of the AICC and this gentleman had access to the records of the AICC and sometimes listened in on the discussions in the Working Committee meetings also.

(c) Shri Atulya Ghosh has denied that he exerted any influence either on the West Bengal Government or the Central Government in order to hush up the case of Shri Sunil Das. He asked the rhetorical question, "through whom did I try?" Now, I am in a position to state that the transfer of investigation of this case from the Special Branch to the D. D. West Bengal, which took place in early August was due, mainly, to the influence of Shri Ghosh with the West Bengal Government. In fact, Shri Hathi was induced by West Bengal officers to make a wrong statement in the House and I have already submitted a statement under Speaker's Direction No.

115 to correct its inaccuracy. If you ask the Home Minister whether such a transfer had taken place or not, you will know what the real position is, as also understand the mischief played by Shri Atulya Ghosh in a serious matter involving espionage.

(d) Shri Ghosh said that when Sunil Das's house was searched, Shri Sunil Das came and reported to him "as a staff of the AICC", and that Shri Ghosh told him that he should make the help of a lawyer; the law of the land was to prevail". Now, we would like to know how Shri Sunil Das, when he was arrested and taken into police custody after the search, managed to go and see Shri Atulya Ghosh? How did the police officers allow him to meet Shri Ghosh? Did the police take Shri Sunil Das to Shri Atulya Ghosh's house in Delhi? Was Shri Atulya Ghosh in Delhi on the day Shri Sunil Das's living quarters were searched in the early hours of 10th August morning? Is it a fact that the West Bengal police took Shri Sunil Das to some place outside Delhi, say, Bombay or Calcutta, in order that Shri Sunil Das could speak to Shri Atulya Ghosh? If so, is it permissible for the police to take a prisoner to the house of a private citizen, however high he may be in the hierarchy of the ruling party? What then is the truth? It is obvious that there is some hanky-panky about the whole thing, and that Shri Atulya Ghosh is deeply implicated in this espionage and subversion case.

(e) After the arrest of Shri Sunil Das and the search of his living quarters, a news item appeared in a daily newspaper in Delhi to the effect that Cash/Gold/Jewellery was found at Shri Das's house. Where has this Cash/Gold/Jewellery gone? Is it a fact that an important office-bearer of the Congress Party prevented the police officers from seizing these things, Cash/Gold/Jewellery? Or is it that when the police took Shri Sunil Das and those things, i.e. Cash/Gold/Jewellery to Shri Ghosh's residence, Shri Ghosh asked the police not to take this Cash/Gold/Jewellery with them? Did Shri Ghosh intimidate the police and persuade them to hand over these things to the Congress treasurer or one of his friends?

1633 (A) LSD.—2.

In fine, Sir, we feel that never before has the sacred procedure of personal explanation been so blatantly abused in the history of this House as has been done by Shri Atulya Ghosh on the 18th August, 1966. If the procedures of the House are not to be reduced to mockery, and if the dignity and decorum of the House is to be maintained, it is necessary to commit this gentleman for breach of privilege and set up a special Committee to try his case properly and expeditiously. I would also suggest that senior and seasoned parliamentarians, belonging to various groups in the House should be appointed to this special Committee and the Committee should be asked to submit its report on the first day of the next session of the Lok Sabha. Permit us, therefore, to raise this issue in the House today.

आखिर में एक ही बात कहूंगा, और उस दिन भी मैंने उस को देखने की कोशिश की थी, कि प्रोप्यमो के बारे में टोरी दल के नेता मैकलायड साहब ने एक विमोचक श्रंग और अपमान का प्रस्ताव रखा था, अपने ही दल के एक भूतपूर्व मंत्री के बारे में। उस का भी जिक्र मैंने किया था। मैं चाहूंगा कि आज सत्तारूढ़ दल में से कम से कम एक कोई बड़ा नेता निकले, मोरारजी देसाई निकलें, पाटिल साहब निकलें, जगजीवन बाबू निकलें, कोई भी निकले, जो आज हिम्मत कर के, वह कांग्रेस पार्टी के खजांची हैं फिर भी जहाँ देश हित का सवाल है, जासूसी का सवाल है, उन के खिलाफ प्रस्ताव लायें, जिस से मालूम हो कि किसी का भी ख्याल और लिहाज कांग्रेस पार्टी या यह सदन नहीं करेगा।

**Shri Manan (Darjeeling):** Sir, the hon. Member, Shri Madhu Limaye said: "some important office bearer of the AICC". That is one thing. Another thing is, Shrimati Renu Chakravarty, a little while ago, asked: "How could Sunil Das have met Shri Atulya Ghosh because Shri Atulya Ghosh was in Calcutta?" How was it possible, at the same time, for Shri Atulya Ghosh to intimidate the police? But, that

[Shri Manaen]  
is not important. What is important is, I beg of Shri Madhu Limaye to mention the name, today or a day later, whenever he chooses, the name of the important office bearer. It is not proper to make a wild allegation like that.

श्री मधु लिमये : कमेटी के सामने जरूर लाऊंगा, मैं डरता नहीं हूँ ।

श्री मनन : अभी बतला दीजिये हिम्मत हो तो, डरते क्यों हैं ।

श्री मधु लिमये : सारी बातें सामने आ जायेंगी, आप चबराइये नहीं ।

Mr. Speaker: Does Shri Atulya Ghosh want to make a statement just now or he wants some time.

Shri Atulya Ghosh (Asansol): Just now, Sir. Sir, I am sorry....

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्बलपुर) : मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जब कोई सदस्य आप से बात करे तब यह कहाँ तक उचित है कि वह काला चश्मा लगा कर अपना मुँह छिपाये।

श्री मधु लिमये : बिल्कुल एक बात है । उन के चेहरे पर क्या भाव है, हम उस को देखना चाहते हैं ।

Mr. Speaker: The proceedings of the House should not be reduced to frivolity. A point of order is raised that an hon. Member wears dark glasses, or on his gesture or movement this way or that way. He should not be criticised in this way at all..... (Interruptions).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, I rise to a point of order. I would like to know, rather the House would like to know, under what rule or procedure, after my hon. friends, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty and Shri Madhu Limaye have raised the question of privilege and made a brief statement on the motion of privilege, Shri Atulya Ghosh is making this statement. Under what rule comprised in the chapter on privilege or some other rule of procedure is Shri Atulya Ghosh making it? It is a personal explanation or what else is it, I want to know.

Mr. Speaker: I want to satisfy myself, after hearing Shri Atulya Ghosh, whether really there is a case that I should refer it to the Committee. I have to satisfy myself on that point.

Shri Atulya Ghosh: Sir, I am sorry that during the course of my personal explanation on 18-8-1966 I made an incorrect statement. You will recall, Sir, that I had made the explanation extempore. During the course of my statement I had said:

"When Sunil's house was searched, as the staff of the AICC he came and reported to me that his house was searched and I told him to take the help of a lawyer."

Immediately after I received the uncorrected copy of my statement from the Lok Sabha Secretariat, I realised that I had made an incorrect statement and I made the correction on the uncorrected copy as follows:

"When Sunil Das was interrogated by the police in his house, as staff of the AICC, he came and reported to me that in his house he was interrogated. I told him to take the help of the lawyer."

From this you will observe that I had no intention of misleading the House, or distorting the truth, as alleged by some hon. Members..... (interruptions). I admit the above incorrect statement was made by me, and I am sorry for it. I am also sorry for not making a statement, earlier correcting my mis-statement.

12 hrs.

About the other points raised by Shri Madhu Limaye: about the first point, I submit that I have no knowledge about the confession, to which the hon. Member referred. I have not seen it. It may be a copy of that which is in the possession of Shri Madhu Limaye. But I have not had the fortune of going through it. So, I cannot say what was in the confession.

I have no knowledge that Sunil Das's name was proposed for the post of office Secretary. Further, I may also add that

there is, no such post as that of Office Secretary in the office of AICC.

I stand by my previous statement that I have exerted no influence, either on the Central Government or on the State Government.

I have already written to the hon. Speaker, admitting my mistake and expressing my regret.

On the day of the arrest of Sunil Das I was not in Delhi.

**Shri Ranga (Chittoor):** Sir, on a point of information. Shri Amarnath Vidyalkar, one of our Members, was once the Office Secretary of the AICC in my days. Am I to understand that there is no post of Office Secretary in the AICC today?

**Shri A. N. Vidyalkar (Hoshiarpur):** I was the Permanent Secretary, not the Office Secretary.

**श्री स० भो० बनर्जी:** (कानपुर): मैं एक प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठाना चाहता हूँ। श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती ने जो चाँजिज श्री अतुल्य घोष के खिलाफ लगाये हैं उन में से दो तीन का जवाब नहीं...

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर रोज करिये। आप यह बताइये कि प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर क्या है। आप तो बाकी चीजों में पड़ रहे हैं...

**श्री स० भो० बनर्जी:** बाकी चीजों में मैं नहीं पड़ रहा हूँ। मुझे थोड़ा सा कहने तो दीजिये, मेरी जबान से कुछ निकल तो लेने दीजिये। यह जो प्रिवलेज मोशन मूव किया है यह कोई अनहोनी चीज नहीं हुई है। बजाय इस के कि प्रिवलेज मोशन के बारे में आप अपना निर्णय देते श्री अतुल्य घोष ने दुबारा एक भाषण दे दिया है। उन्होंने कहा है कि आई हैव गिवन एन इनकोरेक्ट स्टेटमेंट। मैं ने इनको रेक्ट स्टेटमेंट किया। बाद में उसको मैं ने कोरेक्ट किया। दो तीन जो प्वाइंट रोज किये गये हैं उनका जवाब हमारे पास नहीं आया है। एक तो उन्होंने कहा है कि मैलिशस प्रायेगंडा उन के खिलाफ किया

है, मॅम्बर ने। दूसरा प्वाइंट यह है कि श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती और श्री मधु लिमये ने कहा था कि कनफेशन स्टेटमेंट जो चौधरी साहब का है वह सदन के सामने आना चाहिये। कम अज कम आप उसको देखें। इसका कोई सैटिसफैक्ट्री जवाब उन्होंने नहीं दिया है। मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि आप इस पर अपना रुलिंग दें।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय:** यह क्या प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर हुआ? यह मेरी समझ में तो आया नहीं है। मैं क्या रुलिंग दूँ इस बारे में। उन्होंने इसका जवाब नहीं दिया, उसका जवाब नहीं दिया, यह कहा गया है। अब मैं क्या रुलिंग दूँ?

**Shri Daji (Indore):** I would like to submit...

**Mr. Speaker:** I have heard enough.

**Shri Daji:** Arising out of the statement, I want a clarification.

**Mr. Speaker:** What clarification can there be when a breach of privilege has been raised by a Member?

**Shri Daji:** Sir, I want a clarification on a point flowing from the statement of Shri Atulya Ghosh.

**Mr. Speaker:** What explanation can I give on that statement?

**Shri Daji:** Please hear me. Sir, you informed the House that the correction was not allowed by you. Shri Ghosh has admitted that. I would like to know when your office informed Shri Ghosh that that correction would not be permitted because he has failed to comply with the procedure prescribed in Direction 115 for making a correction. Today is 3rd September. The statement was made on the 18th of August. The copy would have reached him on the 19th. Normally, we are asked to send back the copy within 24 hours. So, on the 20th Shri Ghosh must have returned it. On what day did the office intimate Shri Ghosh that it is not possible?

**Mr. Speaker:** There is no procedure whereby we inform a Member that we have not allowed the correction that he has

[Mr. Speaker] made. Therefore in this case also we did not make that. That Question does not arise. Next day he had made the correction, within 24 hours or 48 hours, whatever is the time. That came to us and we thought that it was substantial; therefore, we did not allow that. The record remained as it was.

**Shri H. N. Mukerjee** (Calcutta Central) : If the record remains just as it was on the 18th, the House, therefore, takes notice of what was supposed to have been said by Shri Ghosh on that day and that brings him under the ambit of the privilege motion unless he corrects it.

**Mr. Speaker** : That I will see. The record remains the same but he has explained that his intention was honest. This is according to him; this is his explanation that as soon as the record came to him he tried to correct himself at that very moment. This is all that he has explained.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** : Sir, I invite your attention to rule 357. There is a moot point. I had brought this to your notice on the 18th August before he made his statement and you were pleased to agree with me and uphold the rule which says:—

“A member may, with the permission of the Speaker, make a personal explanation although there is no question before the House, but in this case no debatable matter may be brought forward, and no debate shall arise.”

I remember very well because I read the record very carefully; you had pointedly and categorically assured the House that you had warned Shri Atulya Ghosh that no debatable or controversial matter could be or should be brought forward by him in his statement. We are grateful to you for that assurance.

Now, from the statement made by Shri Atulya Ghosh today it is obvious,—and also from the statement made earlier by Shrimati Chakravartty and Shri Madhu Limaye—that not merely was debatable and controversial matter brought forward in that statement but also a certain attempt was made by him that day contrary to the directions and instructions issued by you with regard to correction of all matter, that no substantial corrections should be made

by any Member except typographical errors or mistakes of that kind. The Member concerned, Shri Atulya Ghosh, sought to make a statement, and thus exposed more or less, his inner conviction that what he had said was wrong; otherwise, he would not have made that statement. Now he says, “I made the statement extempore”. Who on God’s good earth asked him to make a statement extempore?

**Shri Daji** : He was asked to make it in writing.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** : That makes the offence worse. The gravamen of the charge becomes more serious. If you had asked him to make a statement in writing and he deliberately disregarded your instruction, directive or salutary advice, who is responsible for that? He himself is responsible for the mess he has landed himself in. Therefore, his attempt to correct what he said that day, later on in the transcript, is.....

**Dr. M. S. Aney** (Nagpur) : It is an afterthought.

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath** : It is not only an afterthought but is wholly *mala fide* and he has committed breach of privilege.

**Mr. Speaker** : I have heard all the new things and the new record that have been brought in. This afternoon or day after tomorrow.....

श्री मधु लिमये : गोपदार को आप अनपा निर्णय दीजिये। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं आप से बात करना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बराबर में चलता नहीं जाऊंगा। और चीजें भी होती हैं। इस से ज्यादा नहीं हो सकता है। जो सुनना या सुन लिया है। अब सुनने की बात नहीं है। और मैं सुनता नहीं चला जा सकता हूँ।

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartty** : Sir, hold it over till Monday. I had asked you to let it go over to Monday but because of the convenience of Shri Atulya Ghosh you asked me that I should leave other work and come here. Now you want us to come

again in the evening. I will request you to hold it over till Monday.

**Mr. Speaker:** All right.

**Shri Manaen:** Sir, may I make a submission?

12.10 hrs.

PRESIDENT'S ASSENT TO BILL

**Secretary:** Sir, I lay on the Table the Customs (Amendment) Bill, 1966 passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current Session and assented to by the President since a report was last made to the House on the 25th July, 1966.

12.10½ hrs.

RE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—contd.

**Shri Manaen:** I want to say just one sentence. Sir, the hon. Member, Shri Madhu Limaye has made a very wild accusation.... (Interruptions).

**Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath:** You cannot go back to it again.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur):** He must be heard.... (Interruptions).

**Mr. Speaker:** The Members on this side must be patient....

**Shri Manaen:** Kindly hear me. I will not take more time. I will just take a minute and say only one sentence..... (Interruptions).

**An hon. Member:** Why should it be reopened again?

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order. The Members on both the sides shall sit down.

When something has been stated on the floor of the House bringing in some Secretary or other high officer in that office and if he wants to say about himself or about somebody, why should he not be allowed to say that?

**Shri Nambiar:** If you open it up again, you will have to give an opportunity to us again. (Interruptions).

**श्री बलजीत सिंह :** (उना) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, विरोधी दल की तरफ से हर रोज कई किसिम के इन्वेन्शन स्टैंट आते हैं और ये हाउस का टाइम ख़ूब करते हैं। आप को इस तरफ के सदस्यों को भी अपनी बात कहने को इजाजत देनी चाहिए।

**Shri Manaen:** The hon. Member, Shri Madhu Limaye has said....

**Shri S. M. Banerjee:** Louder please.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it a personal explanation that he is going to give?

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** He should be given a chance. What is this? It is surprising. You must allow him to speak.

**Shri R. S. Pandey (Guna):** He should be allowed to say whatever he wants to say. The Opposition is always given an opportunity.... (Interruptions).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, order.

**Shri R. S. Pandey:** Let him say whatever he wants to say.

**Mr. Speaker:** Not whatever he wants to say.

**Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:** You must allow him to say whatever he wants to say on this topic.

**Shri R. S. Pandey:** He wants to say something about this. He should be allowed to say that

**श्री रामसेवक यादव :** (बाराबंकी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, इन को सस्पेंड कर दीजिए।

**Shri Manaen:** Without meaning any offence to the hon. Member, Shri Madhu Limaye or any other Member of the Opposition, I merely wish to submit this. If the hon. Member has any objection to the word "Wild", I would merely say that he has made a certain statement. He has said that some important office-bearer of the A.I.C.C. has prevented the police officer from performing certain duty and so on and so forth.



[Shri Manaen]

I only want to submit this. Let the hon. Member, Shri Madhu Limaye, have the courage now. If the statement that he has made is proved, I give my word of honour that I will resign from this House but if the accusation that he has made is proved incorrect, is he going to resign....

(Interruption) Secondly, I will submit let, let Shri Madhu Limaye have the courage to make the statement outside this House. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri R. S. Pandey: Let Shri Madhu Limaye answer this.. (Interruptions)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order,  
Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: All shall sit down. (Interruptions).

This is not the manner. Order, order. There ought not to be so much of excitement.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: All shall sit down. Every one should sit down.

Shri R. S. Pandey rose—

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Pandey also should sit down. I have been asking him to sit down. He is still standing.

I will just remind the members of the House that this House has got ample authority to punish any Member and the severest punishment it can give can even extend to expulsion of the member, expulsion from the membership. (Interruption)

Shri Atulya Ghosh rose—

Some hon. Members: Sit down, sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri D. N. Tiwary (Gopalganj): If they are going to interrupt like this, we shall not allow any of them to speak. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Is this the manner in which the proceedings of this House would

be conducted? I am appearing to both sides and not to one side. I am asking all the members. This is not the way in which democracy is to be run. I am sorry that even the Speaker is not allowed to make any observation.

The members have a great responsibility. If they have this freedom of speech inside the House they have a responsibility also to see that they do not make any accusations or imputations which are not correct. They have to satisfy themselves that there is at least some reasonable cause for believing that there would be some truth in that. A rumour or something heard second-hand or seen in the paper alone is not enough to make imputations and accusations. This freedom given to the members is certainly to be exercised with great restraint and every member has a responsibility of his own to satisfy himself first, and if any member, whoever he might be, either on this side or on that side, makes a reckless statement or an accusation as I have said, this House has got full authority to punish him to the severest extent; it can take any action, which can extend to the expulsion of the member from the House. But that has to be seen when something is proved. I have just now said that I will look into all the charges that have been made. If I cannot decide now—I have been asked to give my ruling—I will give my ruling or decision whether I can give my consent or not, on Monday morning.

Mr. Hem Raj.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय , क्या आप मुझे एक स्पष्टीकरण करने देंगे ? मेरे खिलाफ माननीय सदस्य ने आरोप लगाया है कि मैंने "वाइल्ड चाजिज " लगाए हैं । मैं केवल यह स्पष्टीकरण करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं अपनी सारी कार्यवाही नियमों के अनुसार करता हूँ । मैंने किसी का नाम नहीं लिया तो फिर वह क्यों खड़े हो गए ? मैं उन को जानता भी नहीं हूँ । मुझे यह भी पता नहीं था कि मैंने साहब भी इस सदन के सदस्य हैं ? अध्यक्ष महोदय , क्या मैंने उनका नाम लिया था ? वह क्यों खड़े हो गए ?

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Hem Raj.—

12.19 hrs.

PETITIONS RE: PUNJAB REORGANISATION BILL, 1966.

**Shri Hem Raj:** (Kangra): I present a petition signed by Shri Gangu Ram and other inhabitants of Una Tehsil, Anandpur Sahib block, relating to the Punjab Reorganisation Bill, 1966.

**Shri Pratap Singh** (Sirmur): I present a petition signed by Chaudhari Shanti Sarup and other inhabitants of Kandi District Hoshiarpur, relating to the Punjab Reorganisation Bill, 1966.

**श्री दलजीत सिंह:** (ऊना) : इस में एक मेरा संशोधन है कि लाखों आदिमियों ने कर्नाल, पानीपत, अम्बाला और चन्डीगढ़ और जो जाबी रोजन के हिस्से पंजाब से अलग किए गए हैं, पंजाब में ही रहने के लिए वहां से रेप्रेजेंटेशन लाखों आदिमियों ने दिये हैं होम मिनिस्टर, प्राइम मिनिस्टर और वांडर्री कमीशन को, वे भी इस पेशीशन में शामिल कर लिये जायें।

**Mr. Speaker:** What does Shri Daljit Singh want to say now? I have not been able to follow him. This is only a petition which is being presented, and nothing can be said at this moment on that.

**श्री मधु लिमये:** (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय कल आपने यह भी कहा है कि आप का बयान भी छप जायेगा, लेकिन आप देखें रहे हैं, मिनिस्टरों की गलतबयानी को ढूँढने के लिये... (व्यवधान) लेकिन हमारी बात तो किसी भी अखबार में नहीं, आयी इसलिए मैं इसे पढ़ना चाहूंगा। मैं आप का ध्यान डाइरेक्शन 115 की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ :

"Member shall make a statement . . ."

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** मैं मेम्बर्स को संकुलित कर दूंगा।

**श्री मधु लिमये :** अध्यक्ष महोदय, बार-बार आपने वॉटे की बहस हमारी तरफ से होती

है, और भी चर्चा होती है लेकिन यह अखबार वाले हमारी एक बात भी नहीं छापते हैं। डाइरेक्शन 115 के अनुसार...

12.21 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. INFORMATION GIVEN BY COMMERCE MINISTER AND MINISTER'S REPLY THERETO

**Mr. Speaker:** Shri Madhu Limaye and the hon. Minister might lay their statements on the Table of the House and I shall get them circulated to the Members.

**श्री मधु लिमये:** लेकिन अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब अखबार वाले हमारी बात को छापते ही नहीं हैं और मिनिस्टरों द्वारा उनको अपना विज्ञापन देने का साधन बनाया जाता है... (व्यवधान)

**Mr. Speaker:** But I can ask him to place it on the Table of the House.

**श्री मधु लिमये:** जहां तक छापने का सवाल है, मैं ने इन की गलतबयानी को पकड़ा...

**Mr. Speaker:** How long is that statement?

**श्री मधु लिमये:** एक सफ का है।

**अध्यक्ष महोदय :** पढ़ लीजिए।

**Shri Bakar Ali Mirza** (Warrangal): On a point of order. May I know whether statements and speeches in this House are to be made so that they are to be published in the press, and if they are not published, whether Members are to be given additional opportunity to make them here so that those things can be published?

**Shri Raghunath Singh** (Varanasi): Should it be forced on us?

**श्री मधु लिमये:** स्पीकर साहब ने कहा, इस लिए मैं ने उसका उल्लेख किया।