

Dated.....20.11.2014

**THE  
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES**

**(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)**

**OFFICIAL REPORT**

2331

2332

**HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE**

*Monday, 23rd June, 1952.*

*The House met at a Quarter Past Eight  
of the Clock.*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

(See Part I)

9-15 A.M.

**DEATH OF SHRI A. S. NANDKAR**

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to inform the House of the sad demise of Shri Anant Savalaram Nandkar who died on the 22nd June, 1952, in Nasik in tragic circumstances. He was elected to the House of the People from Thana—Reserved—Sch. Tribes constituency.

The House will join me in conveying our condolence to his family. The House may stand in silence for a minute and express its sorrow.

**POINT OF PRIVILEGE**

**REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES  
✓ CERTAIN PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE  
BY DR. S. SINHA**

**Mr. Speaker:** During the course of the debate on the 11th instant on the Demands for Grants under the head "Defence", Dr. S. Sinha—the hon. Member from Saran East—said the following with reference to the speech made by the hon. Member Shrimati Renu Chakravarty on the 10th instant:

"I have compared her speech and found that it was word for word—I would say the general line—from

73 PSD

an article written by one Lemin in the month of February".

This statement of his provoked interruptions from a section of the House, and the hon. Lady Member challenged Dr. Sinha to put the papers before the House. It is not clear what her object was; but it appears, she probably wanted the papers before the House for a comparison, which would, according to her, show that her speech was something different from the article, or, at any rate, it was not a word for word copy, as alleged.

Later on, there was heat in the debate on Dr. Sinha making certain remarks. These are irrelevant for my present purpose. At the end of that small storm, the Deputy-Speaker remarked as under:

"If any hon. Member refers to any document, or reads any extracts from it on the floor of the House, he must place it on the Table of the House."

This direction of the Deputy-Speaker, though apparently couched in general terms, has to be interpreted in a limited sense in the context of the speeches and the situation. The incident, if I may use that expression, ended there, and nobody had, till then, raised any question of breach of privilege, either of the House or of any member thereof; nor the question of genuineness or otherwise of the documents referred to by Dr. Sinha was raised. Obviously, such a question of genuineness or otherwise could not be raised, as the papers were not before the House.

Next day Dr. Sinha asked for permission to lay on the Table of the House the documents referred to by him in his speech the previous day. He did this in pursuance of the advice given by the Deputy-Speaker. He was permitted and the documents were laid on the Table of the House on the 12th.

[Mr. Speaker]

On the 17th instant, Shri A. K. Gopalan addressed me a letter requesting my consent to his raising a question, involving the breach of the privilege of the House. He raised the question in the following terms:

"That the House of the People was misled by an hon. Member of the House who made false statement to the House in the course of the debate on Defence Budget on 11th day of June, 1952, by stating that the speech of another Member of the House, namely, Mrs. Renu Chakravartty, was made to order and was the reproduction of a speech sent in advance by some person outside India and thereby the said Dr. Satya Narayan Sinha made breach of privilege of the House.

Further that the said Dr. S. N. Sinha also committed breach of privilege by laying on the Table unauthenticated copies of documents whose genuineness is in question."

As I felt doubtful on the question, I conveyed to Shri Gopalan the nature of my doubts and requested him to supply me with authorities and references in support of his position. He was good enough to give his note in writing on the 20th instant. The main points made out by him in his letter of the 20th instant are:

- (i) Dr. Sinha made certain fantastic allegations and cast certain aspersions against the hon. Lady Member Shrimati Renu Chakravartty;
- (ii) Dr. Sinha said that the speech of hers on the floor was not her own. It was merely a reproduction word for word etc.;
- (iii) The documents are false, fabricated and forged; a casual perusal of the said documents prove themselves as rank forgeries, brought up for the occasion;
- (iv) The documents are neither original nor certified copies obtained from the legal authorities expected to be in possession of the originals in the usual and normal course of business;
- (v) The act, placing the documents, in support of his fantastic, false statement of facts, is *mala fide* in nature and ulterior to purpose.

On these facts and inferences, it is alleged that Dr. Sinha's intention was:

- (i) to lower the prestige of the hon. Member, Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, thereby lowering the prestige of this House in the eyes of the public;
- (ii) to mislead this House in forming the opinion on the subject under consideration.

Shri Gopalan alleges that the breach of privilege of the House consists (i) in the Member making and bearing himself a false witness to speak to certain facts which never existed, and (ii) in placing on the Table of the House false, forged documents with fraudulent intention.

At this stage, I need not discuss the authorities and the references that are given to me by Shri Gopalan in support of his case of breach of privilege. They appear to be distinguishable. But, in any case, the question of determination of the genuineness or otherwise of the documents placed on the Table of the House by Dr. Sinha is a factual matter, which cannot be decided on the materials before me, or on record at present. I think, even assuming that my doubt is ultimately ascertained to be well-founded, I think, it is necessary, in the first instance, to examine the genuineness or otherwise of the documents laid on the Table of the House by Dr. Sinha, if the question of privilege has any relation to, or depends upon, the question of the genuineness or otherwise of those documents. Even otherwise, such an examination is necessary to prevent the production before the House of any documents, which are not genuine or are fabricated, and to see that no Member misleads intentionally or unintentionally any section of the House, by referring to or placing on the Table of the House documents, which are not genuine and are ultimately found to be forged or fabricated. Hon. Members of this House carry a great responsibility in this respect, and it is well that the quantum and limits of their responsibility are well set out by the House, even though it may be taken to be a question, more of propriety than of privilege.

In view, therefore, of the complicated and mixed character of the issues involved in this matter, I have preferred to refer this matter to the consideration of the Privileges Committee of the House, instead of deciding it myself or constituting a special committee only for the purposes of examining the

genuineness or otherwise of the documents produced by Dr. Sinha on the 12th June, 1952. The Committee will go, not only into the limited question of genuineness or otherwise of the documents produced, but also of allied questions including the question of any breach of privilege and other incidental matters as also the question of standards expected of a member of this House

## PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE

### STATEMENT *re.* MEETINGS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** I beg to lay on the Table of the House a Supplementary Statement showing the meetings of the Standing Committees attached to various Ministries and subjects discussed at such meetings during the period from 1st February to 31st March, 1952. [See Appendix VII, annexure No. 39.]

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East):** Arising out of this Sir, may we know the position about the formation of the Standing Committees? You will remember that you stated before the House that an opportunity would be given to Members and that they would be consulted before a final decision was taken. We are seeing newspaper reports to the contrary. May we know what the position exactly is?

**Mr. Speaker:** That question does not, strictly speaking, arise on this occasion. If and when a motion comes, or if it does not come ultimately, I think the question can be raised at that time.

**Dr. S. P. Mookerjee:** If it does not come?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member can wait for some time and then put questions. I believe there is also a question tabled by a certain hon. Member. I am told that a question about the intention in respect of Standing Committees was put and the hon. the Prime Minister said that the intention was to abolish them. That is the position.

**Dr. Lanka Sundaram (Visakhapatnam):** I think the Prime Minister stated the other day that it was for the House eventually to decide it.

**Mr. Speaker:** The House can take such steps as it can. There will be many occasions. It will be sitting the whole of next month.

**Shri Radhelal Vyas (Ujjain):** Sir, you have been pleased to refer a case just now to the Privileges Committee. The matter has been raised by one hon. Member who is also a Member of the Privileges Committee. Now, what will be the procedure? I would like to know whether he will take part in the discussions and also have a right to vote in the Committee when the matter is discussed.

**Mr. Speaker:** That will be a question which will primarily be decided by the Privileges Committee itself as to what procedure it will follow. The hon. Member himself will consider the matter as to how far he should participate, but whether as a Member of the Committee or as a person raising particular points, I think, he will certainly be entitled to be heard. But we are not concerned with that here. We are concerned with matters about privileges. Here I may again remind the House what I once said that it is not a party question at all, nor is it purely a personal question. Members are sitting there as Members of this House without carrying any labels or having any preconceived notions. Their sole consideration being the dignity and the privilege of the House and its Members. Those who are in Government today might tomorrow or after some time be in the Opposition, and the Opposition might be in the Government. Therefore, our chief objective is to create and set proper precedents which will be a guide for all times, irrespective of any party or personal considerations. And I believe the Privileges Committee will function always in that manner. Still, if any question arises, so far as the point raised by the hon. Member is concerned, the Privileges Committee is entitled to make a reference to the Speaker. The Committee is functioning under the directions of the Speaker. That does not mean that the Speaker interferes in their day-to-day work or deliberations. Only when they refer a point for decision then that point is decided by the Speaker.

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

### ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

**The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha):** I beg to move:

"That the Members of this House do proceed to elect, in the manner required by sub-rule (2) of rule 198 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House of the People, twenty-five Members