

**The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar):** Sir, shall I read out the statement? It is a one-page statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Only one page? Very well, then.

**Shri Datar:** Clause 61 of the Angul Laws Regulation, 1936, imposed restrictions on transfer of the rights by tenure holders or ryots and provided that if any tenure holder or ryot transfers his right in tenure or holding or any portion thereof without obtaining the written consent of the Deputy Commissioner, the Deputy Commissioner may, in his discretion, eject the person in possession of the land in respect of which such transfer was made and may either—

- (a) restore the land to the tenant who transferred it, or to any of his heirs, or
- (b) resettle the land with another tenant. It appears that this provision in the laws was found necessary when the Angul Sub-Division was a backward area and the tenants were considered incapable of protecting their property against intrusion of more sophisticated people from outside. To validate such unauthorised transfers, however, a penalty by the name of validation fee was being charged at Rs. 5 plus five times the rent during the current settlement. The practice of levying validation fee was declared invalid on 21st April 1958 by the Orissa High Court and accordingly has been discontinued since then. No validation fee is realised now from the people of Angul.

2. Section 6 of the Orissa Land Reforms Act confers the right of transfer on all ryots subject only to restrictions contained in sections 22 and 23 relating to the transfer of land by

ryots belonging to Scheduled Tribes. As soon as the Land Reforms Act is brought into force the difficulty, if any, of the ryots of Angul in the matter of transfer of landed property will cease to exist.

12.20 hrs.

RE: QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

CERTAIN REMARKS IN THE NEW AGE

**Mr. Speaker:** There is a notice of a question of breach of privilege by Shri Hem Barua against the Editor, *New Age*. The other day I said that we would call for his explanation. Shri Joshi, the Editor, has sent some explanation.

I showed it to Shri Hem Barua who had tabled the motion.

Some remarks were made in *The New Age*. The following is the portion that appeared in the newspaper:

“One can only say that prejudice makes some people so utterly blind sometimes that sense of proportion is completely lost and to defame certain policies and persons connected with them they can stoop to the lowest mendacity.”

This is the portion that appeared in the newspaper. The other day, before giving my consent, I wanted to know what the editor had to say. He was given some time. Ultimately he has said, after explaining that he was out of the station, as follows:

“Regarding the matter raised in your letter, I must at once submit that I had or have no intention whatsoever to commit any breach of privilege of the Lok Sabha nor do anything which would hamper any honourable member of the House from discharging his duties in the House.

The comments quoted in your letter and which appeared in the *New Age* dated 2nd April were made in the context of expressing

[Mr. Speaker]

honest and bonafide opinion on the statements made by Shri Hem Barua regarding the Rudrasagar Oil well. I may also submit that the portion quoted in your letter only means that there was a tendency to distort facts and I considered that as an editor of a responsible newspaper it was my duty to bring to the notice of the public such matters involving national interest. I felt the Government in the present case was not being criticised fairly and correctly.

I once again assure you that in making the above publication there was absolutely no bad intention at all and no disrespect was meant to the House or to any of its honourable Members."

I asked for the reaction of Shri Hem Barua on this. He wants to raise it in the House.

**Shri Hem Barua** (Gauhati): As soon as I saw the statement of the editor, in the ordinary course, I would not have liked to raise it on the floor of the House. But there are certain facts in it that compel me to make a humble submission.

There are serious and grave charges made against me, namely of "prejudices making me utterly blind", as also my "losing my sense of proportion completely", at the same time of "trying to defame certain policies of the Government"; also, I am charged of "stooping to the lowest mendacity". These are the charges made against me.

Now the editor comes out with an explanation that he has made the charges on a particular matter, namely about my statement on the Rudrasagar Oil well. But it is not so. If you, Sir, peruse the columns of the newspaper of 2nd April, you will be convinced of the fact that there are three counts on which the writer of that resume based his allegations against me. The first was in relation to my position about Tibet. I wanted the Prime Minister to explain his at-

titude towards Tibet, and quoted from Mr. Nehru's *Glimpses of World History*, page 842, 1939 edition, that Tibet was independent. I wanted to know from the Prime Minister as to what are the reasons for his now withdrawing from that position. The Prime Minister explained his attitude and also the attitude of the Government of India *vis-a-vis* the Tibetan situation. And the *New Age* has quoted this statement of the Prime Minister to its benefit. Is it any evidence of stooping to the lowest mendacity? Is it any evidence of going utterly blind?

The second thing was about the Chinese delegation to the Peace Council here. I was perturbed that the Chinese delegation was carrying on a propaganda against India. When the Chinese delegation said that "India seeks to inherit the seeds of British imperialism"—these words are within quotation marks—I found that Mr. Chou En-lai is also doing the same thing through television and the press. He has started a campaign of slander against India. That is why I put a question to the Prime Minister. I asked: why is it that the Chinese delegation attending the Peace Council in Delhi are allowed to carry on a campaign of slander and hatred, Mr. Chou En-lai's campaign of slander and hatred, against India, in the very heart of this capital city? This was an innocuous question, because I felt that that propaganda was systematically being carried on. Is it an evidence of stooping to the lowest mendacity? Is it an evidence of losing completely the sense of proportion?

About Rudrasagar Oil well, Shri K. D. Malaviya made a statement here. But after that Shri Mathur, Director of Geology in the Oil and Natural Gas Commission addressed a meeting of Members of Parliament in the Central Hall and made certain statements. When I compared the facts given by him with the facts given by Shri K. D. Malaviya, I found some discrepancy. And, honestly speaking, it is because of his discrepancy that I drew the attention of

the Minister concerned, and he was given an opportunity to clarify the actual position *vis-a-vis* the Rudra-sagar oil well.

I have been honest all along in my professions. But here are people who have doubted my honesty, levelled allegations against me, cast aspersions also against me. Where are the "evidences of this particular Member trying to defame certain policies of the Government"? My attitude about private and public sector is very well known through the speeches I have made and the questions I have put here. If you, Sir, peruse all these points that I have raised, one by one, I can say that everybody who has an iota of grey matter left in his skull would inevitably come to the conclusion that here is a man who is honest, who tries honestly to discharge the duties entrusted to him by the electorate. But I am sorry to say here is a group of people who, with jaundiced eyes, see nothing but jaundices everywhere. A diseased mind is always a devil's workshop. Whatever it is, I would have very much liked the editor to have come out with a straightforward expression of regret. That he has not done. On the other hand, he tries to justify what he has said. But I think I should show my magnanimity after saying all these things, since he says that he has not meant any disrespect to the House. But at the same time, I would say a hundred times that he has tried to cover up or camouflage these ill-founded attacks against me by wrong statements. But in spite of that, I cannot be bullied, I cannot be threatened. I have that amount of courage. In spite of these allegations and charges I will be going on discharging the responsibilities entrusted to me by my people.

But whatever that might be, since he has said that he did not mean any disrespect—he has not expressed any regret—but since he has said that he did not mean any disrespect. I do not want to press the privilege motion I withdraw the privilege motion.

But at the same time, Sir, I would say that this is true, that a sovereign Parliament and the freedom of the press should co-exist. But when the freedom of the press means licence for some and when some people indulge in all sorts of nasty things, it is our bounden duty to raise it on the floor of the House and draw your attention and the attention of the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** It is so good of Shri Hem Barua to have withdrawn the notice of the question of privilege. But I thought, so far as the reply is concerned, that the reply might have been more unequivocal. Using expressions against a Member that he is "stooping to mendacity" and so on and so forth—not only in this case but against any Member—is likely to detract from his legitimate duties. Therefore, I am happy that Shri Hem Barua has shown an amount of magnanimity and that he does not want to press the question.

No further action will be taken on this. The House will now proceed to the next item of business.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

STATEMENT RE: SHORTAGE OF POWER  
 IN CALCUTTA AREA

**The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim):** I beg to lay on the Table a statement regarding the shortage of power in the Calcutta area. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-2914/61].

**Shri Prabhat Kar (Hooghly):** Today we have received information that the Chairman of the D.V.C. has said that the 70 megawatts of power in the city of Calcutta has now been increased to 90 mega-watts but the restriction which has been imposed on the various industrial units will continue.

I want to know whether as a result of the restrictions continuing on the industrial units, there will be stoppage of work and whether the stoppage of work will hamper production. I also want to know from the hon. Minister when he expects the industrial units