

Mr. Speaker: He cannot say, 'if' or 'but' now.

Shri Tangamani: 48 hours have passed since the sentence, and that is why I have brought it to the notice of the House.

Mr. Speaker: It is very wrong. He ought not to bring it to the notice of the House like this. If there is any grievance, he could write to me, and I could give him the information. Or, if he wants to condemn any particular person, there are motions for that purpose. The motions are already given. If I agree, I shall bring them up. It is very wrong to raise it in this manner.

Shri Tangamani: If.....

Mr. Speaker: I cannot say 'if' or 'but'.

Shri Tangamani: 48 hours have passed. I have brought it to the notice of the House....

Mr. Speaker: It is very wrong. The hon. Member ought not to bring it to the notice of the House like this. If there is any grievance, he could write to me and I would have given him the information. Or if he wants to condemn any particular person, there are motions and if I agree, I will bring them up here. But this sort of procedure is very wrong.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: I would just like to ask one thing. I think normally this is done. Recently in the case of Shri Yajnik when he was sentenced, the matter was communicated to the House. So I was just wondering whether normally this is not done.

Mr. Speaker: Who ever denies it? If any Member of Parliament is arrested, the Magistrate must communicate it to me. If he is released, that also is communicated to me. I am not in a position to say whether in this case it has been communicated or I have read it out here. Hon. Members might have been watching. On some days they are not here. I also do not exactly remember what all cases I have read out here. If he gives me

intimation, I will find out and then take steps myself, if necessary, to raise it on the floor of the House. I would have allowed the hon. Member to do so. There is no good taking me by surprise. I am not disallowing anything.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.

12.12 hrs.

RE: MOTION OF PRIVILEGE

Shrimati Manjula Devi (Goalpara): I have given notice of a motion of privilege, and as it is very urgent and important, I request you to read it out to the House, and allow me to move the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I will not allow her to move it. The hon. Member came to me with a motion of privilege and gave it to me. Under the rules, I am entitled to look into the matter before I bring it up before the House, whether it is really a matter of privilege or not. She told me about this when I was entering the Chamber. Then I said that normally, if I find that there is a *prima facie* case, I bring it before the House; otherwise, I take the advice of the Privileges Committee. Opinions also can be asked for. I have sent it to the Privileges Committee. But the hon. Member told me that she wanted to go away. Therefore, the whole House must tune itself to her convenience. I then asked when she was returning. She said, on the 14th. Then I said that in the meanwhile I would not pass any orders; I would wait till she came back. Then she said: 'No, no. You must bring it up today'. I must adjourn the House to hear this matter! This is meaningless. She wants the House to discuss this according to her convenience and I must adjourn the business of the House for that! The business of the House ought not to

be interfered with like this. Whether it is 'he' or 'she', I am not going to allow.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.

Shrimati Manjula Devi—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member must resume her seat.

—

12.14 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Statement on action taken by Government on Assurances

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of each of the following statements showing the action taken by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given by Ministers during the various sessions shown against each:

1 Supplementary Statement No VII Fourth Session 1958 of Second Lok Sabha [See Appendix IV, annexure No 63].

2 Supplementary Statement No IX Third session, 1957 of Second Lok Sabha [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 64]

3. Supplementary Statement No XIV Second Session, 1957, of Second Lok Sabha [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 65].

4. Supplementary Statement No XV First Session, 1957 of Second Lok Sabha [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 66].

5. Supplementary Statement No. XX Twelfth Session, 1956 of First Lok Sabha [See Appendix IV, annexure No. 67].

REPLIES TO MEMORANDA ON DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS)

The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri S. V. Mamaswamy): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the statement containing replies to certain memoranda received from Members in connection with Demands for Grants (Railways) 1958-59. [Placed in Library, See No. LT-894/58]

WEALTH-TAX (EXEMPTION OF HEIRLOOM JEWELLERY OF RULERS) RULES

The Deputy Minister of Finance (Shrimati Tarkeswari Sinha): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (4) of Section 46 of the Wealth-tax Act, 1957, a copy of the Wealth-tax (Exemption of Heirloom Jewellery of Rulers) Rules, 1958, published in Notification No 719 dated the 23rd August 1958 [Placed in Library, See No. LT-895/58]

—

12.14½ hrs.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR 1958-59.

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Dr. B. Gopala Reddi): I beg to present a statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1958-59

—

12.15 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

WASHING AWAY OF TWO BRIDGES ON CENTRAL RAILWAY

Shri K. S. Ramaswamy (Gobichetipalayam). Under Rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon —

'The washing away of two bridges between Kazipet and Balharshah on the Central