

[श्री जांगडे]

हैं और उन शहरों के पीछे लाखों बादमी दाने दाने के लिए तरसते हैं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि हम परसनल इनकम.....

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member will kindly resume his seat. I forgot. The hon. Member **Shri V. G. Deshpande** is here, I thought he would take up the matter. He brought it to the notice of the House yesterday or day before yesterday that there was a cordon of police outside the House, that it was practically difficult to come into the House and that he was prevented. That is what he said, I tried to make enquiries. The hon. Home Minister himself is here. I would like to know from the hon. Minister if he has made any enquiries and if he has anything to state.

The Minister of Home Affairs and Heavy Industries (Pandit G. B. Pant): Yes, Sir.

The Superintendent of Police, New Delhi, made a personal enquiry into the matter. He has reported that on receipt of information that about 8,000 refugees would demonstrate in front of the Lok Sabha, a strong contingent of the police including some gazetted officers and upper subordinate were detailed by him to cordon off the Lok Sabha Estate. It was apprehended that the demonstrators would defy the ban and enter the prohibited area.

At about 11-30 A.M. the procession of refugees arrived at the Lok Sabha outer entrance facing Parliament Street. They were in an agitated mood and the police on duty had been alerted not to allow any demonstrator to defy the ban. **Shri V. G. Deshpande** was among the demonstrators and when he, with three or four others, proceeded towards the Lok Sabha Estate, two constables of the D. A. P. checked him to ensure his identity. Inspector B. P. Jetley, S.H.O., Parliament Street Police Station, who was only a few yards away, rushed to the spot seeing **Shri Deshpande** whom he knew, and escorted him in, expressing his regret.

The entire incident is reported to have taken not more than four or five seconds. This was about three yards outside the Lok Sabha Estate entrance. The Watch and Ward Officer of the Lok Sabha was immediately informed about it.

Shri V. G. Deshpande (Guna): May I make a statement?

Pandit G. B. Pant: **Shri Deshpande** either deliberately accompanied the demonstrators or the time of his entry happened to synchronise with their presence there.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Hooghly): Before the hon. Minister speculates, will it not be fair to hear....

Pandit G. B. Pant: There is no question of any speculation. It is a fact as stated here.

Mr. Speaker: He made a complaint yesterday and I am asking the Minister to make a statement.

Pandit G. B. Pant: I am saying either he came with them or he happened to be there at the time when those people arrived there. So, there was this unfortunate incident. Had he arrived a little earlier or not come with them, I think no such occasion would have arisen. He came with them. Then there was, I think, reason for them to see if these people were coming. They did not know him personally. Nobody interfered knowing him personally. So, I do not know if I am called upon to say anything more.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Mr. Speaker, Sir....

Shri S. S. More (Sholapur): May I know whether at the time of the enquiry....

Mr. Speaker: Was the hon. Member present there?

Shri S. S. More: No.

Mr. Speaker: Now, **Shri Deshpande**. He is the person affected. He has raised the question. Let me hear him.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I do not know whether I should be called upon to stand for cross-examination before the Home Minister after he has made derisive remarks against me. When I am a colleague Member in the House and it is the privilege of a Member that has been attacked, I have a right to speak because I have a grievance to make.

Yesterday, the Home Minister himself has not alleged that the demonstrators had broken any ban. Perfectly legal activities as alleged by him were being carried on by them. Whether I came with them or whether it was a coincidence, I am not going into the matter. I did not come with them, I make an assertion.

Then the second positive statement I make is that I did not come with three or four persons. In fact, I was coming alone. The police stopped me. One or two persons from there shouted, "He is an M. P." and still they would not allow me. It is true that after some time one sub-inspector came, and when I was scuffling with those people, when I was telling them I was a member of the Lok Sabha they were not allowing me. Shri Chattopadhyaya told me that he showed his identity card, still he was not allowed to come. He says that he has written a letter to the Speaker also.

Then, the third is yesterday in order to explain these matters, I went to the Speaker. It was a matter which involved the privilege of a Member. I must have done it before the session but the matter happened after the session had already started. I feel that I may be an Opposition Member, may be a demonstrator, may be a subject of ridicule for any Member or section or party of the House, but it was the duty of the Home Minister before believing the Superintendent of Police saying that three or four persons came, to have asked me. I humbly offered myself to the Speaker. This is the chit I wrote, I went to the Speaker, he was sitting in 475 LSD.

the room. I wrote to him: "Dear Sir, I have come to talk to you regarding the morning incident. I had expected that you would call me, but I am volunteering to come and explain. Yours truly, V. G. Deshpande." The answer given in pencil by the Speaker is: "I am making enquiries. I shall send for you if necessary after half an hour." I was not sent for. Now, the Home Minister is given an opportunity to make any kind of remarks against me. I think the leader of the House himself should have taken up the matter. He may be an ordinary or a single Member, you do not like him, but I say when a Member makes a complaint that a police officer obstructed him when he was coming to the House, it is the dignity of the Leader of the House that is assaulted. It was not Deshpande but Pandit Nehru who was stopped and every Member of the House who was stopped. I protest that in this matter if you had wanted that any enquiry should be made, then my colleague Members who from the Privileges Committee should call me for cross-examination. I am prepared to undergo any punishment if they give. I again humbly appeal to the Speaker that the police officers who say that I was stopped have not cared, had not the decency to express regret that any Member of Parliament was put to inconvenience. I seek the protection of the Chair both from the police and their bosses the Ministers.

Shri S. S. More: Will you please allow me.....

Mr. Speaker: What is the point now? We have heard both sides. I am entitled to decide the question of privilege. Two points hon. Members have raised. It is regrettable that any Member of Parliament should be prevented from coming into Parliament. Shri Deshpande was coming to Parliament, and as a matter of fact, he came to Parliament. Now, inside the Parliament here, there are persons and police who see the Members from day to day. I have also made provision for some of our officers and clerks.

[Mr. Speaker]

Watch and Ward, to see them, also to be present there, to avoid any of these unhappy incidents. It may be that, perchance, one of the Watch and Ward officers may not know; he might not have seen him or out of the five hundred odd Members, he may not be able to recognise him; to help him, some others are also posted there.

But if it had happened outside this compound, then what would be the position? Of course, it happened a few yards away from the compound wall. It might have as well happened on the other side where the crowd was there. Now, so far as that matter is concerned, the question is each hon. Member will have to satisfy the authorities there that he is a Member of Parliament.

Now, let us assume that he starts from Connaught Place, and there is a huge crowd; the police do not want any other persons to come. Then, he has to tell them, 'I am a Member of Parliament, I am entitled to go'. Leaving alone Shri Chattopadhyaya, so far as the hon. Member is concerned, he does not appear to have shown them the identity card.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: I have said that I had told the police officer that I was a Member of Parliament. You do not believe me still? The verbatim records will bear me out when I say that I have said so already.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of believing one as against the other. The hon. Member says this. The Minister of Home Affairs could not have been present there; he can only depend upon his officer.

Shri V. G. Deshpande: He should have made an enquiry first. He did not have the courtesy to ask me.

Mr. Speaker: If an enquiry ought to be made, the hon. Member, by an interruption cannot have an enquiry.

The Minister can only act upon the report that he gets. He has already read out the report. As a matter of fact, he did not tell us that he believ-

ed every word of that report. He was cautious enough to say that it may be or it may not be correct.

But so far as we are concerned, we are not concerned so much with the hon. Member's having participated in the demonstration. We are not worried about it. It is open to any hon. Member straight to lead a deputation, or to participate in some demonstration or something of that kind. But I do not know, and I am really considering still whether an hon. Member in front of the House can make a demonstration, when he himself can be a Member there, for, in that case, he would be demonstrating against himself. These are all peculiar difficulties that will arise.

But so far as this is concerned, it is unnecessary for us to decide it. The point is that the hon. Member has been prevented. By whom? By certain constables. As soon as the Sub-Inspector saw him from a distance, he came running up, and then told them that he was a Member of Parliament; thereafter, he brought him inside.

Now, under these circumstances, this may happen and hon. Members may be stopped at times. I shall find out what steps can be taken. As matter of fact, for some time past, I have been thinking seriously over this matter. When the Parliamentary Delegation from Turkey came here, they had a kind of silver or golden badge over their coats. I have been thinking whether we also can adopt some such thing, to avoid any difficulty, and hon. Members may wear some badges,—the badge will also look like a rose in their coats. Or else, they have to take some identity cards with them.

Shri Gadgil (Poona Central): That is transferable.

Mr. Speaker: I know, in some cases, if the identity cards are not taken, difficulties will arise. In fact, when I was Deputy-Speaker, I had gone into the Central Secretariat; they refused

to allow me inside. Unfortunately, I had no identity card with me. I had not taken my 'pass-port' with me. So, I had to send some Sikh or some other man. And after fifteen or twenty minutes, a clerk came, and he said 'You are standing here?' Then with the aid of that clerk, I went in.

Dr. Suresh Chandra (Aurangabad): We can also have some mark on the forehead.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. This is not a matter to be pooh-poohed. It is very wrong on the part of the hon. Member to have said that there can be a mark on the forehead.

I am referring here to something which was done elsewhere.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I did not mean anything wrong.

Mr. Speaker: I am really thinking whether I shall place this matter before the General Purposes Committee, as to what can be done for the purpose of identifying hon. Members even from a distance. Normally, for persons inside the House, no identification mark is necessary, or no card is necessary. I shall see to it that at every gate, a responsible officer or some employee of the Lok Sabha Secretariat is kept to assist the Watch and Ward staff. So, on such thing will happen inside the House.

So far as what happens outside is concerned, we cannot be responsible for that. All that I can say is that sometimes, it so happens that a police officer does not know a Member. As soon as he comes to know, the Member is allowed ingress. In this case, as soon as the sub-inspector came to know, the hon. Member was allowed ingress. The sub-inspector being more responsible he brought him inside.

Under these circumstances, I do not think....

Shri V. G. Deshpande: Before you give your ruling finally, I have just to point out that it was not done on the road, but on the main approach to Parliament. People were standing there, forming a chain, and they did

not allow anybody to come in, saying that their instructions were that nobody should be allowed to go in. Is it not necessary that regret should be expressed.....

Mr. Speaker: May I make one suggestion to the hon. Member? He has made a statement now. If he wants to make any further statement, he may kindly write to me whatever he has to say, so far as this matter is concerned. I shall consider this matter further as to what ought to be done.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: I want to raise a procedural point. When a Member was coming to attend the Parliament session, he was refused ingress into the Parliament, practically at the door, at the point where he should enter the Parliament's precincts. I think before the Minister made a statement, it was his duty to have contacted the hon. Member and to have got his version; and then, it might have been necessary to further pursue the matter with the obstructing police officers. It is really a serious matter. It is not that outside the House, something has happened, but the point is that at a particular point of time, you have got to come from outside to inside.

I am appealing to you that this is a question of privilege, and we should not treat it in a lighthearted manner. And I do protest against this kind of enquiry being made by the Minister, that he only heard the police version and did not hear the version of the hon. Member who was involved in the matter. He ought to have heard the hon. Member, and possibly, it might have led to further enquiries, and interrogation of the persons against whom complaints have been made; and you, Sir, might have referred this matter to the Privileges Committee or dealt with the matter yourself.

Shri S. S. More: May I bring it to your notice that I had already stood up to make a submission? But you had asked me to resume my seat, and some other persons got priority over me. Probably, mine was not a very influential voice.

[Shri S. S. More] .

My submission is that it is a serious matter of frequent occurrence, and something has to be devised to give complete protection to Members of Parliament, if their privileges are privileges of substance. If you merely refer the matter to the General Purposes Committee, the committee will say that we should carry a placard on our heads, that we are Members of Parliament, and nothing more.

My submission is that this is a matter, which constitutes, according to me, a serious breach of privilege of a Member,—which has also been the experience of many hon. Members—and, therefore, it ought to be referred to the Privileges Committee for a final decision. And I do submit that the Privileges Committee is the proper body which can go into this matter in the light of precedents in other countries, and will finally be able to settle the matter.

Shri Gadgil: Badges and bands are....

Shri Sadhan Gupta (Calcutta South-East): On a point of order. The Home Minister in his statement has said that either Shri V. G. Deshpande got deliberately among the demonstrators, or otherwise he got mixed up. I would submit that when the Home Minister is not sure of his facts, he should not even throw out the suggestion that a Member of this House got deliberately into a demonstration, which, he alleges, had the aim of defying the law and entering into the precincts of this House. This is not only incorrect, as the hon. Member says, but even the Minister himself is not sure of it.

Under these circumstances, I would ask for your ruling whether he can make such a suggestion in this House.

Shri Gadgil: I only wanted to say that bands or badges are useless. According to my experience, the identity card is the best. But there is one question which seems to me very important. I want to know whether

the Home Minister accepts it as a fact that even after showing the identity card to the constable or constables concerned...

Mr. Speaker: No identity card has been shown.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Nobody alleges that an identity card was shown. Shri V. G. Deshpande does not say that he showed the identity card. He did not show the identity card to anyone. In fact, I did not want to say that.

Under the rules, the policemen are required to satisfy themselves about the identity of the Members. It is for the safety of Members. Any other man may smuggle himself into the House or do something that is undesirable, and it may lead to something disastrous even. So, it is in the interests of the Members that the police should satisfy themselves. It was a very short affair. Nobody suggests that they had any intention of causing any inconvenience to Shri V. G. Deshpande. Within a few seconds, the whole thing was started; and he did not show any identity card. I did not raise any objection on that ground. But I do not see how any question arises of any privilege or anything like that in that sense.

Dr. Suresh Chandra rose—

Mr. Speaker: How long am I to go on with this discussion?

1 P.M.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: I want to bring to your notice in this connection something which happened inside the precincts of this House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member will write to me about it.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: It is an important matter of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow this. The hon. Member will resume his seat.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: You have allowed so many Members.

Mr. Speaker: But I am not going to allow the hon. Member to proceed.

So far as this question of privilege is concerned, Mr. Deshpande interrupted the proceedings yesterday. He came to me excited and therefore I thought that there was something important.

Normally, a question of privilege is not disposed of in this manner. Mr. Suresh Chandra has been wanting to raise his own question of privilege.

Dr. Suresh Chandra: It is not a question of my privilege; it is a question of the privilege of this House.

Mr. Speaker: A question of privilege of a Member of this House is a privilege of this House.

Any hon. Member wishing to raise a question of privilege should give notice of a motion in writing to Secretary. Yesterday it was raised in an unusual manner. On his way to the House he met me and I allowed him to raise it. So far as this matter is concerned, it is better that he writes to me giving all the facts, and I shall consider whether a question of privilege is involved.

So far as the Minister is concerned, I would request that in future whenever an individual Member says something from his personal knowledge, I would request the hon. Home Minister to hear him before he makes a statement to the House. That would be the right thing.

Pandit G. B. Pant: Can I submit a word? There is no question of hearing. All Members of this House are my colleagues, but I cannot ask anyone to make a statement; I have no authority at all to do that. Something is placed here before the Speaker and I place the version I get. If the Members authorise me to make an enquiry I can. But to ask a Member to make a statement is not within my jurisdiction. I can ask the policemen, but I cannot ask the Members to give me their version.

Normally, so far as these matters are humbly offered myself to the Speaker.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: It is not a question of giving one's version to the Minister, but ordinary courtesy demands that before the Minister concludes his part of the enquiry and reports something to the House and to the Speaker, he should at least give him a chance of making his statement. Otherwise the enquiry *vis a vis* the police will not be complete.

Mr. Speaker: Both are right. So far as the hon. Member is concerned, he made his representation here; he did not make a representation to the Minister. He made a representation to the House and I requested the Minister to make a statement. He has made a statement. In future whenever I receive a complaint about a matter of privilege, I shall have a statement from the Member and if I think further elucidation is necessary I shall ask the hon. Minister before a final statement is made in the House one way or the other.

Normally, so far as these matters are concerned, excepting extraordinary cases happening, I do not want any hon. Member to raise it here suddenly. When certain facts are not clear on one side, I think the better method would be to put it in writing and send it to me.

I was sorry to hear Mr. Chatterjee saying that I made certain observations in a light-hearted manner.

Shri N. C. Chatterjee: No, I did not say that. I said it is a serious matter and we should not treat it lightly. I never cast a reflection on you.

Mr. Speaker: If Mr. Deshpande has anything further to say, he will write to me. As at present advised, nothing can be done. Mr. Jangde.

Shri S. L. Saksena (Gorakhpur Distt.—North): How much time remains for this debate?

Mr. Speaker: As long as the House is willing to sit.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Let us have a Post-prandial sitting to-night.

1.05 P.M.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

RESOLUTION RE SECOND FIVE YEAR PLAN—concl'd.

श्री जंगड़े : सभापति महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि हमारी औद्योगिक नीति इस प्रकार की है कि उस के अनुसार चलने से हमारे देश में कतिपय लोगों की पूंजी बढ़ती जा रही है और हजारों, लाखों आदमी गरीब होते जा रहे हैं। शहरों की जनसंख्या बढ़ती जा रही है, और उसी शहर के रहने वाले लाखों आदमी स्लम एरियाज (गन्दी बस्तियों) में रहते हैं, जर्जर स्थानों में गुजर करते हैं। उनके लिये खाने पीने की जगह नहीं, मोने की जगह नहीं। यह हमारी आर्थिक व्यवस्था का कुपरिणाम है। हमने अभी तक केवल प्रोडक्शन (उत्पादन) की ही तरफ देश में ध्यान दिया है, वितरण की ओर नहीं। केवल उत्पादन की ओर ही ध्यान देने के कारण और पाश्चात्य देशों की औद्योगिक नीति को शत प्रतिशत अपनाने के कारण हमें सफलता नहीं मिल रही है, क्योंकि पाश्चात्य देशों की नीति हमारे लिये उपयुक्त नहीं होती है। मैं आप को यह बतला सकता हूँ कि एक उद्योगपति, एक लक्षपति कारखाना खोलता है, कारखाने में हजारों आदमी काम करते हैं। उसी के पड़ोस में वही उद्योगपति कपड़े का उद्योग या होटल खोल लेता है। जो मजदूर वहां पर काम करते हैं और रुपया कमाते हैं, उन का सारा रुपया घूम फिर कर उसी उद्योगपति के पास चला जाता है। इसका परिणाम यह होता है कि हमारे गरीब देश के पास पर्चेजिंग (क्रय) शक्ति नहीं रही। हमारे देशवासी गरीब होते जाते हैं और हमारा देश गरीब होता जाता है क्योंकि उसके पास पूंजी नहीं रहती। यह कह देना कि

हमारे देश की नेशनल इनकम (राष्ट्रीय आय) में वृद्धि हुई है काफी नहीं है। इस में यह बताया गया है कि १९५० में हमारे देश की राष्ट्रीय आय पर कैपिटा (प्रति व्यक्ति) २५३ रुपये थी, १९५५ में २८१ रुपये थी और द्वितीय पंचवर्षीय योजना में उसे बढ़ा कर ३३० रुपये करने का प्रापका विचार है लेकिन मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो ३३० रुपये जो राष्ट्रीय पर-कैपिटा इनकम होने वाली है उसमें हमारे गरीब आदमियों का कितना भाग होगा और जो लक्षपति और करोड़पति पूंजीपति हैं उनका कितना भाग होगा, हमारे देश के जो सरकारी नौकर हैं जो ब्यूरोक्रेट्स (नौकरशाही) हैं या जो मध्यम श्रेणी के लोग हैं, उनका भाग कितना होगा। मैं इसका पूरा स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ। जहां तक मैं समझता हूँ जो यह पर कैपिटा इनकम ३३० रुपये की होगी वह मुश्किल से १५ या १६ प्रतिशत आदमियों की होगी। बाकी की मुश्किल से १०० रुपये होगी। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि इससे कम ही होगी। इस लिये मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देहात के जो रहने वाले होंगे उन की ओर दूसरे आदमियों की आय का क्या अनुपात होगा। केवल सैम्पल सर्वे (नमूना सर्वेक्षण) से जो निष्कर्ष हम निकालते हैं वह ठीक नहीं हो सकते हैं क्योंकि हर एक गांव की हालत एक सी नहीं हो सकती, इसलिये इस को आधार मान कर यह कहना कि देश की राष्ट्रीय आय में बढ़ोतरी हो रही है यह गलत है।

इसके उपरान्त मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अभी तक हमारे देश में ४,८०० करोड़ रुपये की योजना है, व्यक्तिगत उद्योगों को मिला कर, जिस में कि २,४०० करोड़ रुपया लगने वाला है, कुल ७,२०० करोड़ रुपये की योजना है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि उससे कितने लोगों को प्रत्यक्ष फायदा होने वाला है और कितने लोगों को फायदा होने वाला नहीं है। देहात के लोगों को, जिन की जनसंख्या