

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मुझे बड़ा अफसोस है कि आप अपनी रिस्पॉसिबिलिटी से काम नहीं लेते। जो कुछ मैं कर सकता था, मैं ने किया। सवाल भी किया, मेम्बर साहबान का काज भी लिया, फिर भी आप कहते हैं कि मैं शेल्टर करता हूँ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : आप पर कोई आक्षेप नहीं लगा रहे हैं।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : जवाब दिलवाइये, अध्यक्ष महोदय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब जो बोलें वह न लिखा जाए।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : * *

श्री बड़े : * * *

मैं कभी जवाबदारी छोड़ कर नहीं बोलता हूँ

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह बात गलत है कि आप कभी नहीं बोलते हैं : जब आप बोलने लगते हैं तो आप बोलते चले जाते हैं और इसके बारे में मैं पहले भी गिला कर चुका हूँ। आप नहीं बोलते हैं कभी मेरी इजाजत के बगैर, यह आप न कहें।

श्री बड़े : मैं केवल यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इस किताब को वह प्रोसक्राइब करना चाहते हैं या नहीं करना चाहते हैं

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): I beg to say that you have been most helpful by intervening on our behalf in getting for this House an assurance from the Home Minister that a certain text-book or a certain portion out of that text-book will be withdrawn.

As you will remember, the grievance of this side of the House is not only in respect of a particular text-

book or in respect of a particular passage but in respect of a whole series of text-books and the tenor and the type of teachings which are imparted through these text-books. In particular, I wish to refer to a certain matter which is referred in the text-book and which relates to the Sikhs—most of my voters. In one of these text-books, it has been made out that in the beginning of the 19th century, when the Sikhs annexed Kashmir with India, before that it was a portion of a foreign Abdali Empire, then the Sikhs committed an act of aggression and on that account Maharaja Ranjit Singh, in particular, and his General Hari Singh Nalwa were tyrants and aggressors.

Sir, I want to know whether the assurance which the Home Minister has given also covers this portion and this text-book.

Mr. Speaker: This cannot be a point of order.

Shri Nanda: The whole series of text-books will be dealt with in this way.

13.14 hrs.

QUESTION OF BREACH OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Speaker: The Finance Minister may make a statement regarding the question of breach of privilege raised by Shri Madhu Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बोल चुके हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं एक स्पष्टीकरण करना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने उस दिन स्टेट-मेंट कर दिया है।

श्री मधु लिमये : उसके बारे में नहीं ।

जिस दिन इस पर बहस हुई उस दिन शचीन्द्र चौधरी साहब ने दो तीन जुमले कहे थे और उसके बाद वह बैठ गये । उस में उन्होंने यह कहा था । ज़रा उस वक्त शोर था इस लिये मैं एक वाक्य पढ़ता हूँ :

"I have heard those points. Whether they are an inquisition or a privilege motion is something which I do not know.

यह जो इन्होंने इनक्विज़िशन शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया, मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आता है । मामला बहुत गम्भीर है । वह विद्वान हैं और जानते भी हैं . . . इनक्विज़िशन शब्द के एक ऐतिहासिक माने हैं और अगर उनकी जानकारी के लिए मैं दो वाक्य आपके सामने रख दू

अध्यक्ष महोदय : उसकी जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : इनक्विज़िशन का आरोप क्यों लगा रहे हैं ? इनक्विज़िशन का मतलब होता है कि "एक्यूज़र" है वही "जज" होता है । क्या इस तरह से कोई कार्रवाई उनके खिलाफ की जा रही है ? वह कोई मासूम या निष्पाप बच्चे हैं और उनकी हत्या करने का काम हम कर रहे हैं ? सोच समझ कर शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया करें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : श्री शचीन्द्र चौधरी ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : मेरा एक ध्यानाकर्षण का नोटिस था . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ध्यानाकर्षण इस वक्त नहीं है ।

The Minister of Finance (Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri): Sir, I am grateful to Mr. Madhu Limaye for having raised this question. He has done it out of public interest and he

has done it in order to lay down a correct procedure so that I, as a Member of this House, not as a Minister, may not, in any way, do anything which would go against the authority of this House. As a Member of this House, I share that desire with him and, as I said, I sincerely thank him for having given this opportunity of explaining myself.

In the process of moving his motion, he had made a mention of certain facts in order to establish that I suffer from a bad habit. So far as the language of the privilege motion is concerned, if I may remind the House—I am reading the English translation of it; I will not be able to read Hindi with ease—it is as follows:

"That the question of breach of privilege committed by the Finance Minister, Mr. Sachindra Chaudhuri, by raising unfounded expectations in the House that the Public Accounts Committee was going to consider the question of clearing Mr. Bhoothalingam, but in fact, no such request for such consideration of its comments on the Bhoothalingam's affairs had been made by the Government to the Committee and when the Committee had not taken any decision to make a special report on the subject be referred to the Committee of Privilege."

This is the only thing to which I am going to address myself.

My friend, Mr. Madhu Limaye, has not given the date on which I am supposed to have done this. But I presume that this arises out of a statement I made here on, I believe, a Call Attention notice on the 27th July, 1966. You will be kind enough to look at what I said on the 27th July, 1966. Thereafter, there was a statement, I think, on the 29th July, 1966—if I am wrong, I may be corrected—made by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. The two statements can be put together. I do not wish to go more than that. I will leave it to you to decide whether

I have or I have not committed what my good friend, Mr. Madhu Limaye, says.

Apart from that, there is another question also. What is the ambit of a question of breach of privilege here? When does a Member of this House—I consider myself as a Member; I do not consider myself as a Minister at all—commit any offence of the privilege of the House? I have tried to find out—again, I must personally thank Mr. Madhu Limaye for raising, this question—by reading such books as are available with me any definition of the particular acts or any principle laid down in the acts upon which a motion of privilege will arise. I have not been able to find that out. These are matters of convention either in this Parliament or the provision referred to in the Constitution. There can be a great deal of debate on this. I will not ask you to consider that because that might mean technical questions and so on. I do not want to take the time of the House on that.

On the 27th July, 1966—I am reading from what I have got, the official transcript of the Lok Sabha debate—there was a Call Attention notice and the Call Attention notice was according to this form:

“Reported decision of Government to appoint Shri S. Bhoothalingam to E.E.C. at Brussels.”

This is what was moved by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:

“I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:

The reported decision of the Government to appoint Shri S. Bhoothalingam as Ambassador to E.E.C. at Brussels in spite of the adverse remarks against him by the Public Accounts Committee in its Fiftieth Report.”

This is what I said:

“I may make a statement here that so far as Shri Bhoothalingam's appointment is concerned, that appointment was made before the Fiftieth Report of the Public Accounts Committee. So far as his posting is concerned, the posting has not been made now. The Government has sent its reply to the Public Accounts Committee. The Public Accounts Committee has not yet made its comments on that and, therefore, there is no question of any posting being made until that report is laid before the House.”

I ask you to be kind enough to remember that I have said, “until that report is laid before the House.”

Then, a certain question was asked by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad. I am afraid, I will have to trouble the House to remind itself of what was said on that occasion.

“Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: May I know whether the Government is in the knowledge of the fact that apart from the serious findings of the P.A.C., the Special Police Establishment has also enquired.....”

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: A similar suggestion was made in the other House half an hour ago. Before that I did not know anything about it. I shall certainly look into this matter.”

Then, I made another statement:

“Before I can give any assurance to this House that there will be an inquiry, I must know what the facts are. I have just said in answer to my hon. friend Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad that certain suggestions have been made about this officer and I shall have to look into them and then make up my mind as to what should be done.”

[Shri Sachindra Choudhuri]

I draw your particular attention to this portion:

"So far as the suggestion of the Public Accounts Committee is concerned, Government have made their observations on that, and we are awaiting what the Public Accounts Committee says about it."

When I said, "we are awaiting", we were entitled to say, in my humble submission, when that was put before the House. The Government had to await the report to be put before the House.

Further, another question was asked by Shri Sinhasan Singh:

"The question was whether the inquiry that was being proceeded with had been suspended."

"Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Minister has already given the answer."

"जवाब आना चाहिये वह नहीं आया है"।

"Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already given the answer. He has said that he will look into the papers and then decide."

"Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): He has not said anything about the suspension of the inquiry."

Then Mr. Sidheshwar Prasad says something in Hindi.

Then I say this:

"As I have said, I came to know about it only half an hour ago and, therefore, I cannot give an answer. I shall look into it. Apart from that, I do not want to be technical in this matter, but this question does not really arise out of the calling-attention-notice."

Then there was another question by Mr. K. N. Tiwari, to which my answer was this:

"As I have already told this House, so far as the report of the Public Accounts Committee is

concerned, Government have made a statement on this part of it also and sent it to the P.A.C., and the reaction of the Public Accounts Committee is awaited before Government can either start a departmental inquiry, calling upon Shri Bhoothalingam to give an explanation or make up their mind that it is not necessary and it should be before any other authority. For that, we have got to wait for the reply of the Public Accounts Committee."

I have said before this House, and I continue to say, that I have got to wait for the reply of the P.A.C. Until the PAC's reply is before it and Government comes to know of it, Government has to wait, I have got to wait.

Then Mr. Bhagwat Jha Azad says:

"Government have only sent their statement. Have they asked the Public Accounts Committee to submit any further report?"

This is a question which was never answered.

"Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The statement of Government has been forwarded by Government to the Public Accounts Committee."

"Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): On a point of order. The question was whether any explanation from Shri Bhoothalingam had been forwarded by Government to the Public Accounts Committee, and if so, what the particular points were, and whether Government had formed any opinion on that explanation furnished by Shri Bhoothalingam. That is a question which the hon. Minister must answer."

"Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: In the other House, I was hauled over the coals because I made a reference to what had been sent to the Public Accounts Committee by Government and what the Public Accounts Com-

mittee had said in their own report; and I was reminded that until the Public Accounts Committee had given actual consideration to the statement that Government had made to the Public Accounts Committee, there should not be any reference to it, and I was reminded of the highest traditions of democracy and particularly Parliamentary practice. May I, therefore, beg of hon. Members here not to press me to give any answers on that point, but wait until the Public Accounts Committee give their own comments or give their own suggestions on anything that I have to do on the Government side?"

Can there be anything clearer than this to show that I was waiting for the P.A.C. to make a report to this House?

"Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Have Government asked for any further report from the Public Accounts Committee? That is what we want to know."

"Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member can ask only one question, and he has already asked the question and the answer has come already."

"Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I am not asking any second question. I want to know whether Government have asked for any further report from the Public Accounts Committee or not. We know that Government generally send their comments on the findings of the Public Accounts Committee. We want to know whether Government have asked the Public Accounts Committee to submit any further report?"

"Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Public Accounts Committee can report only to Parliament and not to Government."

I stick to that.

"Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: Have Government asked the Public Ac-

counts Committee to submit another report to Parliament?"

"Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Government have sent their statement to the Public Accounts Committee already. The hon. Minister has already said that. But the Public Accounts Committee cannot report to Government."

I accept that.

Then there is a question by Mr. Azad again. He says:

"We want to know whether Government have asked the Public Accounts Committee to submit any report to Parliament about this or not. We want a reply to that question."

"Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is for the Public Accounts Committee and not for Government. Government cannot direct the Public Accounts Committee."

"Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is no other agenda before the House. So, the House will now stand adjourned and meet again at 11 a.m. tomorrow."

I think it is fair that this House should be reminded of what was stated by the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee.

It was on 28th July, 1966. You allowed Mr. Azad to ask a question and this is what you said:

"Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad has given me notice under rule 377. He might put a question."

"Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Yesterday in reply to my Calling Attention, the hon. Minister of Finance replied:

"The Government has sent its reply to the Public Accounts Committee. The Public Accounts Committee has not yet made its comments on that and, therefore, there is no question of any posting being made until

[Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri]

that report is laid before the House.'

'He further added:

'....Government have made their observations on that, and we are awaiting what the Public Accounts Committee says about it.'

'In the light of this reply, I would request you to permit me to ask the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee whether the PAC is examining this case with special reference to Shri Boothalingam's involvement in the case, whether any....'

Mr. Speaker: Is it very necessary to read all that?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: Because this has been stated in the House....

Mr. Speaker: I can read that, I shall see the record when I have to decide about it. If he wants to say anything in defence, in reply to what Mr. Madhu Limaye had said, he may.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: My submission is that the whole privilege motion is based on an incorrect understanding of what happened in this House. I have given in extense what I had said in the House and my only submission is that there cannot be any question of anybody reading into it that I was trying to mislead the House, telling that there was a request made by Government to the PAC that there should be an inquiry into the conduct of Mr. Boothalingam and a report made to the Government on the basis of that. That is perfectly clear. That is the only observation that I have to make. I do not wish to take much time of the House.

Mr. Speaker: I will read the whole debate. I would not allow any questions now.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ने कह दिया है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : नहीं कह दिया है । पहले आप मुझे सुन लें और बाद में इस बारे में फैसला कीजिए ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ने पायंट आफ प्रिविलेज रखते हुए अपना स्टेटमेंट दे दिया है ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय ने कई बातों का उल्लेख किया है । उन्होंने बताया है कि उन्होंने लोक सभा में क्या कहा है, उधर क्या कहा है। इस लिए उन सब बातों के बारे में आप मुझे भी अपनी बात बताने दीजिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने आप को पायंट आफ प्रिविलेज रोज करने के लिए मौजा दिया आप ने उस को रोज किया। मिनिस्टर साहब ने उस का जवाब दिया है। अब मैं अपनी फैसला दूंगा ।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप मेरी अर्ज सुन लीजिए। जो इश्यूज हैं जो सबल हैं मैं उन को पेश करता हूँ, फॉर्मूलेट करता हूँ । फिर आप निर्णय दीजिए। उन्होंने कुछ छोड़ा है। मैंने भी कुछ छोड़ा है। मैं जगदा समय नहीं लूंगा। मैं आपका रुतब बर रहा हूँ । मंत्री महोदय ने मेरे प्रिविलेज मोशन का केवल एक हिस्सा पढ़ा है। सदन के सामने क्या प्रिविलेज मॉशन है, उस के बारे में आप मुझे कुछ अर्ज करने दीजिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने आप को अवसर दिया था, तो आप ने अपनी बात बर्हानी ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय ने अपनी सफ ई दी है। क्या आप मुझे उस के बारे में नहीं बोसने देंगे ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जैसे कब तक चलेगा। माननीय सदस्य हमेशा बोलते रहें हैं। अब दूसरे सदस्यों को भी बोलने का अवसर मिलना चाहिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : मंत्री महोदय ने सारा विवाद विवाद पढ़ने में इतना समय बिगाड़ा है, लेकिन माननीय सदस्य ने उन को नहीं रोका। उ होने जो कुछ कहें मैं उस के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं उन से कम समय दूंगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैंने श्री मधु लिमये को पहले सुना है। उन्होंने बीच-बीच में प्रवि-क्षेत्र का पायंट रास्ता हुए पोजीशन को फॉर्मूला किया। अब मैंने मिनिटर साहब को भी सुन लिया है। मुझे इन दोनों को देखने दिया जाये। मैं नेक्स्ट वीक इस का फॉर्मूला दे दूंगा।

श्री मधु लिमये : मुझे थोड़ा ब्रह्म करने दीजिये।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: (Hoshangabad): Permit me, Sir, to invite your attention to Chapter XX of "Rules of Procedure" and I would like you to enlighten us as to what stage the House has reached in this matter.

Chapter XX—Privileges—Rules 222 to the end.

On the last occasion under Rule 222 you gave consent. Rule 225 goes on to say that the Speaker, if he gives consent under rule 222 and holds that the matter proposed to be discussed is in order, shall call upon the member concerned, and the member, while asking for leave shall make a short statement thereon. That stage, we have passed. Then the next stage will be reached—the subsequent rule. At this stage, as far as I understand the rules, if objection to leave being granted is taken by any member of the House or by the Treasury Bench, what happens? The rule is explicit on this point. It says that the Speaker

shall request those Members who are in favour of leave being granted to stand in their places. There is no other rule which intervenes; once your consent is given, the Member asks for leave, and then the other side replies. There is no provision here which intervenes so as to bar your calling upon the Members who are in favour of leave being granted to stand in their places, unless it be that there is some direction by the Speaker, of which I am not aware.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): He will amend the rules. Let not my hon. friend worry.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Kamath should realise that I have never said that I have given consent. The mere fact that I gave him an opportunity to formulate what he wanted to say at that moment does not imply automatically that I had given my consent and I had held that it was in order and that the leave also had been granted. How does the hon. Member say that we have come to that stage?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: This rule is explicit. Kindly read the rule.

Mr. Speaker: First, I have to hold that it is in order....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The rule says that the Speaker, if he gives consent, shall ask the Members who are in favour of leave being granted to stand in their places. My hon. friend has formulated his point, and now....

Mr. Speaker: When a Member gives me a notice, in order to satisfy myself that really it is in order, I allow him an opportunity and hear him.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): That stage has passed. The Member has made his point, and you have already asked for the explanation....

Mr. Speaker: No.... Did I give my consent? Did I say that leave was granted?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You may not have said that, but for all practical purposes this has been done.

Mr. Speaker: 'For all practical purposes' is a different thing. Before I decide that a thing is in order, the Members also just insist that they must be heard. Before they are heard, how can I decide that it is in order or not? Therefore, I had given him that opportunity. Therefore, I had asked him not to go into the details of it. I had said that I would see and look into it. If I hold that it is in order, then we can proceed further.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: When will you give your consent? Will you give your consent later?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अब आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिए । मैं केवल जो विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न मेरा है उस के सम्बन्ध में चार बातें रखूंगा । आप उस के ऊपर निर्णय दीजिए । मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है । मैं ज्यादा समय भी नहीं लूंगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मिस्टर मधु लिमये, एक तरफ तो अभी आप ने सुना मुझ पर एतराज हो रहा है कि वह स्टैंज ही पास हो गई है

श्री मधु लिमये : आप सुन लीजिये । फिर बाद में फैसला दीजिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप पहले मुझे देखने दीजिये ।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जरा मेरी बातें सुनिये कि कौन से नुक्ते हैं, प्वाइंट्स हैं जिन को मैं रखना चाहता हूँ ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपने प्वाइंट्स बताये और मैंने सुन लिया ।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, नहीं हुआ है ऐसा . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मुझे रूल्स के बर-खिलाफ न ले जाइए । मुझे होल्ड करने दीजिये कि इज इट इन आर्डर आर नाट ।

श्री मधु लिमये : मुझे इस बात को साफ करने दीजिये

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सारा समय इन्हीं के लिये है, यही बोलते रहेंगे

श्री मधु लिमये : आप चुप रहिये । पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी की इज्जत का सवाल है ? मैं 5 मिनट में खत्म कर रहा हूँ । 5 मिनट से ज्यादा एक सेकेंड भी मुझे मत दीजिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मिस्टर मधु लिमये, इसका एक दूसरा असर भी आप देख रहे हैं . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : दूसरा असर कोई नहीं है । मेरा प्रिविलेज का प्रश्न है पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी के बारे में, पूरे सदन की इज्जत के बारे में वह है । मेरी बात को पांच मिनट में सुनने में क्या एतराज हो रहा है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ने प्वाइंट्स रेज किये थे, वह मैंने सुन लिया

श्री मधु लिमये : तो उस का तो कोई जवाब ही नहीं दिया

अध्यक्ष महोदय : किस प्वाइंट का जवाब नहीं दिया? (अवधान) . . .

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 4 नुक्ते हैं . . . (अवधान) एक सत्राल

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मुझे फैसला पढ़ते देखें दीजिये

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह मेरा व्यक्तिगत मामला नहीं है। पब्लिक एकाउण्ट्स कमेटी का मामला है, पूरे सदन का मामला है। इस तरह क्यों किया जा रहा है। कोई कांग्रेस और विरोधी दल का मामला नहीं है। (व्यवधान) :

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस तरह तो और बन्त जा रहा है। अब आप लोग मुझे तो हाइस चलाने दीजिये। मैंने कहा कि मैंने होल्ड नहीं किया है कि इट इज इन आर्डर। इन को जो कहना था इन्होंने कहा। मैंने तो यही कहा कि इन्होंने जो कहा है उस पर फाइ-नेंस मिनिस्टर को क्या कहना है? वह भी बन्त मैंने दिया और सुन लिया। इसीलिये डीटेल्स में जाने से मैंने रोक दिया क्योंकि डिस्कशन का सवाल पैदा नहीं होता। तो अब यह कह रहे हैं कि जो पाइंट्स इन्होंने उठाये थे उस का जावाब नहीं दिया, तो वह प्वाइंट्स इन को रखने दीजिये कि क्या प्वाइंट्स हैं।

श्री मधु लिमये : एक नुक्ता यह है कि इन्होंने

एक माननीय सदस्य : चैम्बर में सुन लीजिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : पब्लिक एकाउण्ट्स कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के बारे में राज्य सभा में

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मिस्टर मधु लिमये, वह मुझे मालूम है।

श्री मधु लिमये : तो यह एक जाहिरा बात की उन्होंने। दूसरी बात—इन्होंने अपने बयान में राज्य सभा में कहा है कि पब्लिक एकाउण्ट्स कमेटी ने बूदर्लिंगम् साहब को सुना तक नहीं

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह भी मैं जानता हूँ

श्री मधु लिमये : आप जानते हैं, सदन भी तो जाने। यह केवल हमारे और आपके बीच में सवाल नहीं है। पब्लिक एकाउण्ट्स कमेटी सदन की एक कमेटी है। उस के रूल 15 की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ

Shri Raghunath Singh: Everybody knows that.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): He is arguing and rearguing and repeatedly re-arguing.

Shri Madhu Limaye: 'If a Ministry has to be represented by more than one....'

Shri Raghunath Singh: कितना पढ़ेंगे? as if we are slaves.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मिस्टर मधु लिमये, मुझे यह होल्ड करने दीजिये कि वह इन आर्डर है या नहीं?

श्री मधु लिमये : यह पब्लिक एकाउण्ट्स कमेटी का मामला दोनों सदनों की कमेटी का मामला है

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : सब लोग इस बात को जानते हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने रूलिंग दी है, अब आप उस पर स्टिक करिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मिस्टर मधु लिमये मुझे देख लेने दीजिये। मैं अब देखूंगा कि आया आप का मोशन इन आर्डर है और फिर उस के बाद अगर मैं इन आर्डर होल्ड करूंगा तो मैं लीव दूंगा . . . (व्यवधान) . . . नहीं, लीव से पहले आप मेरिट्स पर न जाइये। . . . (व्यवधान) मिस्टर मधु लिमये, मैं आप को मना कर रहा हूँ।

श्री मधु लिमये : नहीं अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह नहीं हो सकता। आप को मुनना पड़ेगा। यह पब्लिक एकाउण्ट्स कमेटी का मामला है। . . . (व्यवधान) . . . यह पब्लिक काउण्ट्स कमेटी का मामला है। . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह स्ट्रेज नहीं है, इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि आप इतना खत्म करिये। (ध्यवधान)

श्री मधु लिमये : यह हुल्लड्डीजी कर रहे हैं, इस लिये आप रोक रहे हैं। मुझे तो आप ने इजाजत दे दी कि मैं जल्दी से कह दूँ.... (ध्यवधान)....

कामत साहब ने जो बताया था रूल उस के मुताबिक आप मुझे लोव मांगने की इजाजत दीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जब तक मैं होल्ड न करूँ कि यह इन आर्डर है, तब तक कैंसे इजाजत दे सकता हूँ ?

श्री मधु लिमये : तो मेरे प्वाइंड्रन सुनिये। दो मुद्दे आप सुन चके हैं।.... अब मुद्दे ही बतलाता हूँ, नियम 15 को छोड़ दीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बार बार आप से कह रहा हूँ.....

श्री मधु लिमये : इस पर बहस होनी चाहिये.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बहस तो जब बाद में आयेगा तब होगी....

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं आप से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ.....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब मैं बार बार इन मेम्बर से कह रहा हूँ कि मैं इजाजत नहीं देता और यह बराबर बोलते चले जा रहे हैं। मैंने इतनी दफा कहा कि जब तक कि मैं होल्ड न करूँ कि इन आर्डर हैं तब तक आप बहस नहीं कर सकते। इस के बाद आयेगा वह वक्त जब मैं इन आर्डर कहूँगा। पहले भुझे फ़ैसला लेने दीजिये तब आप अपना कैस रखिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : फ़ैसला लेने के पहले आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिये।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं नहीं सुन सकता।

श्री मधु लिमये : यहां भी नहीं सुनेंगे, चेम्बर में भी नहीं सुनेंगे ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : चेम्बर में बेशक आइए।

श्री मधु लिमये : आप यहां भी नहीं सुनते हैं, चेम्बर में भी नहीं सुनते हैं।

13.38 hrs.

RE. QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that on the 29th July, 1966, I received notice of a question of privilege from Shri R. Umanath, M.P., against the *Navasakthi*, a Tamil daily of Madras "for having referred to Members of Opposition Parties of the Lok Sabha as 'rowdies' and 'goondas', while reporting the opening day proceedings, in its issue dated the 26th July, 1966."

I called for the explanation of the Editor of the newspaper. He has replied by his letter dated the 2nd August, 1966, as follows:

"We wish to state that the unruly scenes that were witnessed on the opening day of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha were described as 'rowdy scenes' by the PTI. A copy of the PTI report is herewith enclosed for your reference. That we have published is translation of the PTI report. But, we find that our staff have committed some mistakes in the translation of the English news into Tamil."

An. hon. Member: It is Kamraj's paper.

Mr. Speaker: The letter further goes on to say:

"We sincerely regret for the same.

As a National Daily we assure you that we have the utmost respect and regard for our Parliament and it was never our intention to show any discourtesy to