

powerful. We have full faith in you. (Interruptions) I request you to immediately order confiscation of the relevant papers and call Mr. Singh to give a deposition . . . (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am going to reach my own decision. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): We have not been observing the rules which govern the question of privilege; that is the cause of the entire trouble,, and ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have read them most carefully... (Interruption)

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Only after you have admitted the motion, can "there be a statement by the person. If that is so, under which rule has this tall talk been going on by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and others'!... (Interruptions)

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: It is the same rule no other rule—under which you were shouting from this side; it is the same rule which helped you to bring the matter of Kanti Desai. The same rule we are quoting. Nothing else... (Interruptions)

SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND: You have already given your ruling; you will decide quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please' sit down. I am going to address the House. I want silence. A ruling can only be given when there is silence and I want silence. (Interruptions) Again, you have started it. The hon. Member will keep his peace and be cool and then let me also say a few words. The matter is a simple one. A Privilege Motion was raised by Mr. Advani. I was not here when the whole Privilege Motion was discussed. Mr. Mirdha informed me. The file came to me. I am taking just a shade of time because I read through all the rules very carefully. I know them as well as anybody in this House and am now applying them. I am going to reach a decision and the

"972 RS—5.

decision can only be two ways. One way is that the Privilege Motion is disallowed by me or if I give consent it is decided one way or the other by the House as per rules. There is no third way. These party shoutings and quarrels are not advancing the matter any further in my mind. I have to reach the decision. Therefore, you must leave me free. All this noise is not helping me in any way. I now request you to allow Mr. Advani to move his Calling Attention Motion. The Privilege Motion cannot be debated now under the rules.

#### CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

##### **Government's decision to scrap the Press Commission headed by Justice Goswami and to appoint a new Press Commission.**

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gujarat): Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Information and Broadcasting to the Government's decision to scrap the Press Commission headed by Justice Goswami and appoint a new Press Commission.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI V. P. SATHE): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Press Commission is not being scrapped. Our Government has decided to continue the Commission with a more comprehensive set of terms of reference.

To recapitulate the Second Press Commission was appointed by Government on 29th May, 1978 under the Commissions of Enquiry Act, 1952. Mr. Justice P. K. Goswami was appointed as Chairman of the Commission.

The Chairman of the Press Commission along with other Members tendered their resignations on 14th January, 1980 on change of Govern-

ISHRI V. P. Sathe] mant. These resignations were accepted on 28th January, 1980.

The Commission is being reconstituted.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, when the Press Commission headed by Justice Goswami tendered their resignation to the Government, they were going through a formality which they regarded as the correct procedure, although it is not imperative, as I see it, for commissions of the nature of the Press Commission to tender resignation on the formation of a new Government. I am aware that there are several other commissions in the country. For instance, there is the Police Commission which has not only not resigned, but which proposes to submit a fresh report to the Government today. The Police Commission was appointed by the Janata Government. The Press Commission too was appointed by the Janata Government. When the Janata Government resigned and a new Government was constituted, even at that stage the Press Commission headed by Justice Goswami, after discussing the matter with other colleagues, came to the conclusion that they should resign as a matter of propriety. They did resign even then. The new Government that was constituted then asked them to continue and told them, "So far as your work is concerned it is very valuable; you should continue to do your work." And they continued to do it. Their term was to end on the 31st December, 1979. They had virtually completed their entire work but some little things remained, the drafting of the report remained and, therefore, they sought permission from the outgoing Government for an extension of time and that extension of time was granted. Three months extension was granted upto 31st March, 1980. Again when the Government changed and a new Government came in, in accordance with their concepts of propriety, they again resigned. Sir, my submission is that it was a formal

resignation and that formal resignation could be accepted only if the Government had substantial grounds for holding that that Press Commission was a wrong Commission, it was not functioning properly just as the new Government always says many things about the Commissions like the Shah Commission or Commissions which they referred to as Commissions which were politically motivated. If the present Press Commission is also regarded as a politically-motivated Press Commission, I could understand the new Minister accepting their resignations. Sir, I may point out that this decision to appoint the Second Press Commission was a decision taken by the Cabinet. It was not a decision taken by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting. It was a Cabinet decision. And if that decision is to be changed, in all propriety, the matter has to go back to the Cabinet and the Cabinet has to decide that these resignations are to be accepted and a new Commission has to be constituted. Sir, it is not the only impropriety of which the present Minister of Information and Broadcasting is guilty.

Sir, I recall very well that this was one of the decisions that had been made in Parliament that the Government had decided to appoint the Second Press Commission. I did it myself and in this House." And it has been the convention of Parliament that whenever Parliament is in session, no major decision is announced outside the House. In fact if this happens, very many Members give notice of a breach of privilege. The Chair however has always held that this is not a breach of privilege, though it is a breach of courtesy, a breach of propriety. If a decision was to be taken when the House is in session, then that decision has to be communicated to the House. In this case, particularly because the original announcement was made in the House, an announcement to accept the resignations of all the members of the Commission should have been

made here. To say that it is reconstituted, is not to put the things correctly. The moment we accept the resignation of the Chairman, that very moment that Commission comes to an end. If it had been the resignations of the other members, and the Chairman's resignation had not been accepted, there was full scope of re-constituting the Commission. But today for the Minister to say that he is going to reconstitute the Commission is, I would politely say, not properly guiding the House; he is misleading like House in a way. I regard this decision to scrap this Commission and to appoint a new Commission as indicative of the new Government's lack of trust in the press, distrust of the press and further an innate allergy to the concept of press freedom which I regard was the pivotal point of all the terms of reference that have been framed for this. (Interruptions). Only the day before yesterday, the Prime Minister spoke in this House and in the course of that speech she accused me personally of having destroyed the credibility of the media. I was surprised. I was listening to her. I did not want to disturb her as she does always. (interruptions) I would say that if she were to provide one shred of evidence in substantiation of all that she said—she said that I have coerced the pressmen or coerced the proprietors into throwing out unpleasant journalists—I would admit it. But not one shred of evidence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may confine your observations to the subject-matter under discussion.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: My case is that the decision in respect of the Press Commission stems out of the basic attitude of the present Government towards the press, towards the media. I have been accused or the last Government went has been accused of destroying the credibility of the media. I can quote here what our Prime Minister said in the conference of A.I.R. National Directors on Sep-

tember 1975. 'She said, "Quite honestly, I do not understand what credibility means. Who has credibility? The newspapers, who had day in and day out printed falsehood". She derides the very concept of credibility and tells the AIR Station Directors, not to be wary, not to be chary, not to be worried about this allegation that you are losing your credibility and go ahead with what you want to do. This is the kind of Government that we are facing today.

श्री श्री कान्त बर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) :  
यह तो आप कहते थे, जिसका पैसा  
उसका प्रेस ।

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी : मैं नहीं कहता  
हूँ, मैं कहता हूँ, प्रेस की आजादी का मतलब  
है कलम की आजादी, पैसे की आजादी  
नहीं । इसलिए टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस में  
हमने इसको प्रमुख स्थान दिया ।

The Janata Government gave primary place to the need to make recommendations in respect of the pattern of the press ownership which could make the press really independent, really free.

Sir, I would like to know what exactly was the stage at which the Press Commission's work had arrived. According to my information, the Press Commission, which was headed by an eminent judge like Justice Goswami, and which included several outstanding journalists like Shri Abu Abraham and Shri Nikhil Chakravarti, neither of whom you can accuse of being sympathetic to the Government's, or the Janata Government's beliefs—in fact Shri Abu Abraham was one of those who were strongly in favour of the emergency, who supported the emergency at that time—, was the kind of commission which was not partisan and which was, in a way, representative of all shades of opinion in the press and the country. This Press Commission was set up by the outgoing Government. It went

[Shri Lai K. Advani]

round the whole country. It visited every single State and every single Union Territory in the country. And, if I am not mistaken—the hon. Minister\* would apprise me what the facts in regard to this are—it examined about 800 witnesses, throughout the country, many more than the first Commission could. And, after all these labours (the expenditure incurred was naturally enormous, something like more than Rs. 30 lakhs) the stage of work that had been reached was that everything was over. The evidences were over. Deliberations and discussions among the members of the Commission were over. Conclusions were drawn in respect of two-thirds of the major matters. Some final discussions were due. The whole report was being drafted. If I am not incorrect, about nine or ten chapters of the report were drafted, already ready. It was only to go for printing. The Government had full authority to say that you can complete your work. We have received your resignations, you are under no obligation to send your resignations, but you thought it proper because a new Government has come in. You have tendered your resignation, all right, we have seen it but we would like you to complete your work. Your work is about to be completed and Rs. 30 lakhs have already been spent, you have gone round the whole country and after we get your report, we will see what to do about it. The Minister says, I found that the terms of reference were not comprehensive. I have been connected with the press, I have been connected with the media also and, therefore, from our point of view, we tried to make the terms of reference as comprehensive as we could. The statement regarding the terms of reference opens thus: "The Press Commission shall inquire into the growth and status of the Indian press since the last Press Commission reported and suggest how best it should develop in future. This is the overall ambit, which;

I suppose, covers everything that the Minister can conceive of, that the Government can conceive of and which may not have been specifically included in what follows. The statement further says that "it shall in particular examine" 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, 10 different items, covering the entire gamut of press functioning. Now, the first sentence says that the Press Commission shall inquire into the growth and status of the Indian Press since the last Press Commission reported and suggest how best it should develop in future.

That, I think, gave full scope to the new Government. If it wanted to add one or two paragraphs, it could do so and say: "This also should be examined because your report does not mention this thing." But they did nothing of the kind. If the House has forgotten, I shall read out the names of the members of the Press Commission. They are;

Justice P. K. Goswami; Shri  
Abu Abraham; Shri Prem  
Bhatia; Shri S. N. Dwivedi; Shri  
Moineudin Harris; Shri Ravi  
Mathai; Shri Yashodhar N.  
Mehta; Shri V. K. Narasimhan;  
Shri F. S. Nariman; Shri Arun  
Shourie; Shri S. H.  
Vatasayan—

all of them eminent persons in their respective spheres of life, and all of them are now told: All right; your resignation is accepted. I had occasion to speak to some of them personally and they said: "We did it in propriety; we never expected it because that would mean that the work that we have done, will never come to light." This is what they say. Because if that comes to light, the people would have known what the Press Commission has done.

Sir, my specific question to the hon. Minister would be, if he says that the Press Commission has not been scrapped is he willing to agree that the same Chairman of the Press Commission who was there, will continue as Chairman of the new Commission? My submission is that the moment you accept the resignation of the Chairman, that very moment, the earlier Commission has come to an end. You cannot say that the Commission is being reconstituted. That is number one. Number two: I would like to know the amount of expenditure that has been incurred on the labours of the Press Commission, the number of witnesses it has examined and the places it visited. If any of the information is not available readily, it may be supplied later. So far as expenditure is concerned, I am sure, it will be available. Also so far as the number of witnesses examined is concerned, it would also be available.

Sir, I think, it is a very bad precedent that he has set in making this announcement outside the House. This calls for admonition from the Chair unless he himself realises it and comes forth saying that henceforth he would not do anything of the kind. My submission is that this is a matter which ought to go for consideration before the Government or before the Cabinet as a whole. Perhaps, I make bold to say, that the Minister of Information and Broadcasting himself is personally not responsible for it. He is only implementing what he has been asked to implement. That is all . . . (*Interruptions*). You will certainly deny it but this I say on the basis of facts. I know. He said to some one a few days back "I cannot say anything; I am waiting" (*Interruptions*).

My last question is: Is he aware of the fact that the entire press has, by and large, reacted very sharply to this decision, that the Editors' Guild has strongly criticised this decision

and that various leading papers of the country have criticised it? I would not like to quote a paper which you would say is biased in favour of me or biased against the Government. I would only quote from the *Times of India* whose first opening sentences are: "The Union Minister for Information and Broadcasting, Mr. Vasant Sathe, has given the lamest possible excuse for accepting the resignations of the members of the Press Commission. He has said that while he appreciates the work the Commission has done, he proposes to set up another with wider terms of reference. But even a casual perusal of the terms of the now defunct Commission will show that those were wide enough. So his explanation will not wash." Sir, I say that this is a purely politically-motivated decision and it only reflects the attitude, the hostile attitude of the present Government to the press. Thank you.

SHRI V. P. SATHE: Sir, I thought that in the Calling Attention he would be asking me questions but three-fourth of his speech was, as if, he was replying to a Calling Attention Notice. Probably, he has not yet forgotten that he has gone on that side, he is not in my shoes.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Sathe, you have also forgotten what you used to do when you were on this side.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: With your permission, Sir,...

SHRI V. P. SATHE: Let me complete. I am not yielding.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister is new to this House.

SHRI V. P. SATHE: I am not yielding, Mr. Chairman. I was coming to the question directly provided he allowed me to do so.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I see that your answer is coming in crisp language.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Let him not make an allegation that I am doing something that I am not expected to do.

SHRI V. P. SATHE: His last sentence was that the whole thing was politically motivated. My first sentence in reply is that your entire speech and the question itself are politically motivated because, Sir, the entire Calling Attention Notice is based on a wrong premise. If you begin with a wrong premise, howsoever long your speech would be, it will all be wrong and the wrong premise is that the Press Commission has been scrapped. If it had to be scrapped, if it had to be dissolved in terms of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, then under section 7, sub-sections (1) and (2) of the Commissions of Inquiry Act two courses were open. One was, if the Commission other than the Commission appointed in pursuance of a Resolution passed by the House of People or as the case may be, the Legislative Assembly of a State, shall cease to exist if it is of the opinion that the continued existence of the Commission is unnecessary. And the other is, the Commission appointed in pursuance of the Resolution passed by the House of People or as the case may be, the Legislative Assembly of the State, shall cease to exist if a Resolution for the discontinuance of the Commission is passed by the House of the People or as the case may be, Legislative Assembly of the State.

Therefore, Sir, if the Government felt that it was not necessary to continue the Commission, because in this case it was not by a Resolution of this House, that this Commission was appointed by the Government, then the Government would have notified and dissolved the Commission. That was the only course in which the Commission could be dissolved. Therefore, Sir, in this case there was

no question of dissolving the Commission. The other alternative is under section 8(a) (ii) where during the course of an inquiry before a Commission, a change has taken place in the constitution of the Commission by reason of any vacancy having been filled or by any other reason, it shall not be necessary for the Commission to commence the inquiry afresh and the inquiry may be continued from the stage at which the change took place. Now, Sir, therefore, there are two things. As I have said, all that has happened is that by resignation here in this case of the members, vacancy has arisen. The Commission is not discontinued. We are not scrapping the Commission.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh): What a childish explanation.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): Now I understand why you are wearing a Cap. You are hiding the vacancy under the hat.

SHRI V. P. SATHE: If there is nothing without the hat, what can I do?

How could we dissolve the Commission except under these rules? And if it is not done, there is no question of going to the Cabinet for that purpose.

I have said—and my friend was waxing eloquent;—that this Second Commission was appointed unlike the First Commission. They did not consult the recognised bodies who are primarily concerned with the Press Commission such as All-India Newspaper Editors Conference, Indian and Eastern Newspaper Society, Indian Languages Newspaper Association, Indian Federation of Working Journalists, National Union of Journalists, Press Association. None was consulted.

SHRI PILOO MODY: And the future Minister of Information and Broadcasting.

SHRI V. P. SATHE: I do not want to go into the question of persons. I have regard for not only Justice Goswami but even one other member as a person. My friend is wrong when he was trying to say that it was done objectively. Most of the members—I would not name them—a majority of them were not professionals—I say a majority of them—and many of them belong to political parties. Do you call that "objective"? (*Interruptions*) Of your party at that time. Therefore, don't wax eloquent that you have done it objectively.

Now, Sir, the Government proposes to consult all these organisations in regard to the terms of reference. I do not want to take up the time of the House in spelling out the terms of reference which will make it comprehensive. But two or three hints may suffice. One is the question relating to the right of an individual citizen to privacy. The entire terms of reference were loaded in favour of the press—and the large press as such, if I may say so. I am concerned with the small newspaper. How is that to be covered? I am concerned with the freedom of the individual citizen as against even the press. How is that to be protected and covered? All these are factors which will have to be considered. We will consult various organisations concerned and then formulate our terms of reference. The work will proceed from where it has stopped. The labour will not be lost; if that labour has been worthwhile.

SHRI PILOO MODY: That assurance you are giving.

SHRI V. P. SATHE: Yes, I say the Commission continues. Therefore all the good work that they may have done will definitely from the basis and it will continue further. Therefore, don't worry. No money will be lost. Nothing will be lost. Only thing is that Press Commission are not things which are appointed

every year and every now and then.

After 25 years..... (*Interruptions*)

Therefore, we want to make it more comprehensive. We want to have a good result which will help us fortunes to come in solving the various problems of the press *inter se* other various institutions and also the people concerned as well as the constitutional obligations.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Will the same Chairman continue?

SHRI V. P. SATHE: That is for us now to decide.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: We are asking you.

SHRI V. P. SATHE: You are more keen about a particular individual. You are being unfair actually. We will try to do our best to see that justice is done in this matter. I can assure that much to the House. Thank you very much.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मंत्री जी ने जिस तरह से इस बारे में जवाब दिया है उससे साफ जाहिर है कि प्रेस कमीशन ने आज तक जितना काम किया है उसका कोई इस्तेमाल नहीं होगा। मंत्री जी ने एक तरफ तो यह कहा कि कमीशन ने जो अच्छा काम किया है उसका उपयोग होगा और दूसरी तरफ उन्होंने यह भी कहा दिया कि कमीशन के अधिकांश सदस्य ऐसे थे जो कि आडवार्णों की पार्टी के थे और वे प्रोफेशनल नहीं थे। तो जब यह आपके मन में भावना है कि जो कमीशन के सदस्य थे उनका सेलैक्शन आबजेक्टिव ढंग से नहीं हुआ था और जब आपका यह एर्लिंगेशन है कि अधिकांश सदस्य आडवार्णों की पार्टी के थे और प्रोफेशनल नहीं थे तो इससे सफ जाहिर है कि आपने यह फैसला पहले से कर लिया है कि उस कमीशन ने जो कुछ भी कार्य किए हैं अब तक

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

जितने भी ब्रिटनेमेज एम्बजिमिन किए हैं और जो रिपोर्ट तैयार की है उसका कोई मतलब नहीं होगा। श्रीमन् . . . .  
(Interruptions) मुझे ऐसा लगता है प्रेम वालों के साथ पिछले दो सप्ताहों में उनके साथ जो व्यवहार हो रहा है मैं मंत्री जी का ध्यान विशेषकर नेशनल हेराल्ड के लोगों के बारे में दिवानी चाहता हूँ . . . .

श्री बी० पी० साठे : मर, हमें बचाइये काल अटेंशन किस सवाल पर है और यह सब आप कहेंगे कि इतना लम्बा हो गया है . . . .

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, साठे साहब बहुत ही अनुभवी पोलिया-मेटेरियन हैं। मैं उनको सिर्फ इतना याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि वह लोक सभा में जो बोलते थे मैं तो उसका शर्तार्थ ही रखना चाहता हूँ।

श्री सभापति : आप काल अटेंशन नोटिस पर ही बहस कीजिए।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : जी हाँ उसी पर कह रहा हूँ। जिस सरकार ने आते ही प्रेम वालों के साथ पत्रकारों के साथ और प्रेम कर्मचारियों के साथ जैसे व्यवहार शुरू किया है उसमें लगता है कि यह प्रेम कमीशन जिस आवेजकेटिव के साथ बनाया गया था जिस उद्देश्य से बनाया गया था वह सब समाप्त हो जाएगा और इमरजेंसी के दिनों में जिस तरह का कैपटिव प्रेस इनकरेज किया गया था और जिस तरह से प्रेम को कंट्रोल किया गया था उस तरह का प्रेम और उस तरह की पत्रकारिता देश में चलाने के लिए उस ढंग का प्रेम कमीशन बनाया जाएगा।

श्री सभापति : अभी तो आप का जवाब है . . . . .

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : जवाब नहीं है यह इनक्रेज है

You are a Judge, and from certain facts certain inferences can be drawn. That is why I am submitting.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The fact is only one.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: After the Government has come to power, within fifteen days....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The moment they nominate the other Commission that fact will come. And this is only one fact.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही: इसीलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ। श्रीमन्, साठे साहब ने कहा कि उसमें कमीशन में अश्रिकांश आडवाणी जी के दल के लोग थे तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि आप इस बात का ध्यान रखेंगे कि अब जो नये सदस्य नामीनेट करेंगे वे आप के दल के ना हों।

क्या आप यह आश्वासन देते हैं कि जो आरोप आप आडवाणी जी के ऊपर लगा रहे हैं उस तरह की बात आपके मन में नहीं होगी। जब आप सदस्यों को नामीनेट करेंगे। तीसरी बात यह है कि आपने अपने जवाब में इसका इशारा भी नहीं किया, आपने सिर्फ यह कह दिया कि टम्स आफ रिफरेंसेज जो होंगे वे मोर कम्प्रीहेंसिव होंगे। हम लोग यह समझते थे कि जब दो साल पहले आडवाणी जी ने मूव किया था उससे 'वेरी कम्प्रीहेंसिव' टम्स आफ रिफरेंसेज होंगे। आप उसमें और एडिशनल क्या एड करेंगे क्या इसका थोड़ा सा आभास सदन को देंगे।



एक माननीय सदस्य : दो तो बतलाये हैं ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : और ये बतला दें कि क्या इस बात का ध्यान रखा जायगा कि जो ऐसा प्रेस कमीशन बनेगा और आप जो उसमें रिफरेंसेज एंड करेंगे, उससे जो रिपोर्ट आयेगी, क्या उससे सचमुच वह मकसद हासिल होगा जिस मकसद से यह कमीशन बना था ?

श्री वी० पी० साठे : सभापति जी, मैं इतना ही कह सकता हूँ जवाब में कि हमारे मित्र जिन्होंने अभी सवाल उठाया वे न्यून गंड से पीड़ित हैं । वे अपना न्यून गंड खोड़ दें तो आप आश्वस्त हो जायेंगे जो कुछ होगा वह सही होगा, न्यायोचित होगा, देश के और प्रेस के हित में होगा और जो गलतियाँ आडवाणी जी ने की वे हम नहीं करेंगे । मैंने शुरू में ही कहा कि आडवाणी जी ने तो बिना किसी से पूछे अपने ही मन से या शायद अपनी पार्टी के मन से किया होगा ये सारे टर्म्स आफ रिफरेंसेज बनाये होंगे पर्सनल भी वैसे ही थे । मैं एक खबरदारी लेने वाला हूँ मैं सबसे सलाह मशिवरा करूँगा और उनकी सलाह लेकर ही टर्म्स आफ रिफरेंस बनाये जायेंगे, जोड़े जायेंगे, तथा जो अच्छे होंगे वे रखे जायेंगे । आप इसके बारे में निश्चित रहे रहिए । जो होगा वह हित में रहेगा ।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मेम्बर आपके दल के नहीं होंगे ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House will now adjourn till 2:30 P.M. and the matter will be resumed after that.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-eight minutes past twelve of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-three minutes past two of the clock. Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

## RE. PRIVATE MEMBERS BUSINESS

SHRI KHURSHED ALAM KHAN (Delhi): I would suggest that today being the private Members days, the private Members' business should be given priority.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I agree with the hon. Member. This is a non-official time. And if the House so chooses, after the non-official business or after 5 o'clock, we can take up the rest of the business. Otherwise, the whole time will be taken by this. There is only one non-official day in the whole week.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : The Chairman had stopped the Calling Attention in between when the Minister was making the reply. The reply was also not complete. Then I asked him about the Calling Attention. He said that it would continue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will continue after 5 o'clock if the House so chooses. I do not think the Chairman could have meant that the non-official business should not be taken up. The issue was not before him. He said that he would continue. I also say that it will continue. We have the tendency in the House to cut non-official time. This has been going on for a long time here, and the hon. Members have protested against it. Our rules specifically say this.

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal) : Why do you change them now?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not changing it now.