

pipeline has been maximised since early this month so as to improve the product availability in the areas affected by the closure of Barauni refinery.]

12 Noon

**RE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE ARISING OUT OF THE STATEMENTS MADE IN THE HOUSE ON THE 29TH JANUARY, 1980 ON THE REPORTED ARREST OF SHRI N. K. SINGH, DIG, CBI**

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI LAL K. ADVANI): I have given notice of breach of privilege against the Union Home Minister, Shri Giani Zail Singh and the Minister of State, Shri Makwana, for deliberately misleading the House in respect of the arrest of Shri N. K. Singh. I think that this is a very important matter. Yesterday, almost all the sections of the Opposition had raised this issue and had sought from the Government full facts about the episode, the shocking episode that took place yesterday morning. It is surprising that in utter disregard not only of the rule of law but even of the privileges of this House, the Union Home Minister and the Minister of State deliberately made misleading statements. If you give me permission, we will have a fullfledged debate on that. But this much I know that the time they were speaking here in the afternoon at about 12-45 P.M., Shri N. K. Singh was arrested and released on a personal bond of Rs. 2,000. This is the report that we have come across, and then..

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHANDARI (Uttar Pradesh): It has appeared in the papers.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It has appeared in the papers. And then the credit is sought to be taken that Mrs. Gandhi, Prime Minister, intervened and get him released. I do not know what to believe. I believe

that if yesterday's incident did not turn out to be a sinister horror story, it is only because of Parliament, the alertness of the Members of both the Houses and also the alertness of a section of the Press because pressmen were present at the point of arrest and took photographs. In fact I know that some reporters actually accompanied the police party from there right up to Gurgaon and were all the while watching what was happening.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Have you permitted a debate?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Early this morning I contacted the family of Shri N. K. Singh.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Andhra Pradesh): Undeclared emergency has started.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: On the same formal plea or technical plea that the Leader of the House is now raising, if yesterday the Members of the Opposition had sat silent, they would have been failing in their duty by the people. We owe a responsibility to the people. I believe that today the family of Shri N. K. Singh is facing the threat not merely of legal prosecution but it is facing the threat of physical liquidation. I am not inclined to exaggerate things.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Has he sought permission to raise it?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Early this morning, I phoned Shri Singh. He was not there. His elderly uncle who is himself a senior Police official in Bihar, spoke to me on the phone, and while he was speaking, he actually broke down and said that throughout the last night the family of Shri N. K. Singh could not sleep for a moment, all the while apprehensive that there is going to be another midnight knock. It seems that with-

out taking recourse to any provision of the Constitution, the Emergency is back again. After all what happened yesterday? Yesterday, Sir, ...

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHAN-DARI: You must be sorry for all this.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yesterday we were told that he had not been arrested. We maintained that he had been physically taken away against his will to Gurgaon. We did not know that just as during the Emergency there used to be no arrests but there used to be illegal kidnappings, Shri N. K. Singh was illegally kidnapped yesterday morning and then arrested in Gurgaon. (Interruptions) Sir, so far as the facts ...

SHRI MAHENDRA MOHAN MISHRA (Bihar): Don't mislead the House.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: So far as the facts are concerned, the facts are now before us all. Now there is nothing concealed. Everything is out in the open. At this particular point of time, I seek your protection to raise formally a motion of privilege against Shri Zail Singh and Shri Makwana for having deliberately misled the House and told utter lies, not on one point but on a score of points. The Chairman himself asked him what is the difference between "arrest", "apprehension" and "taking away". And the Minister coolly says the Member may refer to the Criminal Procedure Code or the I.P.C.

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHAN-DARI: He said "C.R.P."

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: One can condone his ignorance on this point. But so far as the second pertinent issue that I raised is concerned, whether it was necessary for any State Government first to seek the permission of the Central Government before apprehending or arresting any official of the State Government, he

flatly says that no permission is necessary. What would happen if tomorrow the Kerala State Government were to arrest a Secretary of the Central Government and take him there for some interrogation and all that? Sir, I have before me the All-India Services Manual which

"No member of the Service shall, except with the previous sanction of the Government, give evidence in connection with any inquiry conducted by any person, committee or other authority."

A Central Government official cannot give even evidence without the permission of the Central Government. And here a senior official, purely because he was performing a duty entrusted to him by the Government, has been penalised, has been punished. And thereafter comes the matter with which we are directly concerned, that is, this House has been told a string of lies, utter lies gross palpable lies in order to mislead this House into believing an untruth. Sir, I, therefore, seek your permission to raise this matter.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Sir . . . . . (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Let me. . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI RABI RAY (Orissa):

उपसभापतिजी, हमने भी दिया है।  
I have given notice of a privilege motion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can raise it. (Interruptions) Order, please.

श्री रबी राय : पहले आप हम लोगों का निवेदन सुन लीजिए ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Leader of the Opposition has raised a point.

SHRI RABI RAY: I have other arguments to give.

मैं दूसरे तर्क देना चाहता हूँ।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : 12 वजे ये स्टेटमेंट देते हैं (Interruptions) इन्होंने मिसलीड किया है।

श्री उपसभापति : मुझे जवाब तो देने दोजिए।

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: My privilege notice is on some other point.

SHRI RABI RAY: It is a matter of procedure . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have not refused . . . सुनिए तो सही मैं क्या कह रहा हूँ। आपको किसने मना किया है।

श्री रबी राय : श्रीमन् . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is entitled to a reply. He raised a point about privilege. His notice of a privilege motion has been received and it is under consideration. Now, Shri Rabi Ray.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV (Uttar Pradesh): He has given notice of a breach of privilege motion. It has to be considered by you. How can the matter be discussed outright here? Under what rule can it be discussed? No, I object. When he has given notice of a breach of privilege, the Chair has to decide what to do with it. How can the matter be discussed?

श्री रबी राय : उपसभापति महोदय, आप इनको बैठोइये, तब मैं बोलूँ।

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV: Sir, on a point of order. My point of order is that the Leader of the Opposition has raised a matter and placed

before you a breach of privilege notice orally. Now the matter is with you. Unless you decide on its admissibility, I object to the matter being discussed in the House. After you decide the matter can be discussed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, there is no point of order. We are not discussing this matter at present. The Leader of the Opposition had given a notice. He wanted to know what had happened to it. I have replied that the notice has been received and it is under consideration. Shri Rabi Ray has also given a notice. He probably wants to know what has happened to it.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I seek one clarification from the Chair, whether more than one motion can be raised on the same subject. You have already permitted the Leader of the Opposition under Rule 190 to raise a privilege motion. I would like to know from the Chair whether you ascertained from the hon. Member if it is under the same subject, whether more than one motion can be raised by more than one Member on the same day and at the same time.

(Interruptions)

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI (Uttar Pradesh): There is no such bar.

(Interruptions)

श्री रबी राय : उपसभापति महोदय, मैंने विशेषाधिकार का नोटिस दिया है गृह मंत्री जी के खिलाफ और मैं ने कल अपने भाषण के दौरान सवाल उठाया था और मैं ने कहा था कि श्री एन०के०सिंह को गिरफ्तार किया गया है। असल में उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल जो चीज हुई और जिस तरह से सरकार का जवाब आया और जिस तरह से जवाब दिया गया उसे देखते हुए मैं आडवाणी जी से पूरी तरह सहमत हूँ। जो बयान कल मन्त्रियों की ओर से दिया गया उस सारे बयान को अगर

आप देखेंगे तो आपको पूरी बात का पता चल जायेगा हकीकत आज अखबारों में आ गया है और श्री एन० के० सिंह का जो बयान है उसने साबित कर दिया है कि भारत सरकार की ओर से दोनों मंत्रों जो कल यहां बोले हैं वह जानबूझ कर हाउस को मिसलीड करने के लिये बोले हैं। मैं आपको बताता हूं कि आज वाक्यांश एन० के० सिंह का बयान अखबार में आया है। वह कहते हैं कि हमको गिरफ्तार किया गया था और हमको दो हजार रुपये के पर्सनल बांड पर छोड़ा गया है।

एक सवाल मैं और उठाना चाहता हूं जो सदन के सामने नहीं आया है। जो डी० एस० पी० उनको गिरफ्तार करने के लिये आया था उसने कहा था कि गुडगांव के सुपरेंटेंडेंट पुलिस उनको इंटरोगेट करेंगे, लेकिन हम को यह पता चला है कि गुडगांव के सुपरेंटेंडेंट पुलिस ने उनको इंटरोगेट नहीं किया। जो डी० एस० पी० उनको गिरफ्तार करने के लिये आया था उसी ने उनको इंटरोगेट किया है। तो इस तरह से दोनों मंत्रियों ने जानबूझ कर सदन को गुमराह किया है और इसलिये यह विशेषाधिकार का सवाल बन जाता है। मैं आप से विनती करना चाहता हूं कि इस सवाल पर आज ही आप को अपना फैसला देना चाहिए और इसको उठाने की हमको अनुमति देनी चाहिए। जो नोटिस हम ने दिया है दफा 188 रूल्स आफ प्रोसीजर के अनुसार उसके तहत हमको विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न गृह मंत्री और गृह राज्य मंत्री के खिलाफ उठाने की इजाजत दी जाये। इसका एक और पहलू है और वह यह है कि सरकार ने कहा है और प्रधान मंत्री जी खुद बोली हैं कि हम विडिक्टिव नहीं बनेंगे, लेकिन कल ही एक सीनियर आई० पी० एस० अफसर को गिरफ्तार कर के सरकार ने यह धमकी और भय अफसरों में पैदा करने की कोशिश की है सर्विसेज में खास कर कि वे उसके अनुसार काम करें। मान लीजिए कि कल को कोई सेक्रेटरी या डिप्टी सेक्रेटरी हो जाता तो उसको सरकार

की मर्जी के अनुसार कार्य करना चाहिए वरना वह गिरफ्तार किया जा सकता है। जो एक अफसर के साथ हुआ वही दूसरे अफसरों के साथ भी हो सकता है। जो कमिटेड नहीं होंगे उनके खिलाफ इस तरह की कार्यवाही हो सकती है और जो संविधान के तहत या रूल आफ ला के तहत जिस तरह से काम होना चाहिए उस तरह काम करेंगे उनको सरकार नहीं चाहती है। सरकार कमिटेड जुडिशियरी और कमिटेड सर्विसेज चाहती है। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हम लोग कौंसिल आफ स्टेट्स के सदस्य हैं और आप इस सदन के सम्मानित अध्यक्ष हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि कल जिस तरह से एक सीनियर आई० पी० एस० अफसर को गिरफ्तार किया गया है उस से सारे अफसरों में चिन्ता है और वे शंकित हैं और डरे हुए हैं और जो ईमानदार अफसर हैं खास तौर से वे कहते हैं कि हम ईमानदारी से अपना कर्तव्य निभा रहे हैं लेकिन हम पर भी कल इस तरह की बात आ सकती है। तो अगर हम प्रजातंत्र को बरकार रखना चाहते हैं और अगर हम इसकी नींव मजबूत करना चाहते हैं तो हमारी सर्विसेज में ईमानदारी और कर्तव्य निष्ठा चाहिए। लेकिन इस घटना से सीनियर अफसर डरे हुए हैं और इन्दिरा गांधी जी का कहना है कि

"You the civil servants, be loyal to the Congress Party and its leaders, not to the Constitution, not to the rules, not to the Rules of Procedure."

इसलिये मैं आप से विनती करता हूं कि हम लोगों को बकायदा नियम के अनुसार इस विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न उठाने की इजाजत दी जानी चाहिए।

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: Sir, my privilege motion is apart from what has been stated by the two leaders of the party and the Leader of the Opposition. I have particularly mentioned yesterday, while the Home Minister was speaking, that I could appreciate the difficulty.

[Shri Arvind Ganesh Kulkarni] But it seems he did not know that extra-constitutional authorities are still working and he was replying in his normal, usual way that he was not arrested, but something was done at his back . . . (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please continue.

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I mentioned particularly the procedure of interrogation such as the issue of notice in the absence of warrant of arrest. When we raised this point yesterday, the Minister said he did not know and that they were informed by the Gurgaon Police or the Haryana Government that he was taken away for interrogation. But there is some procedure for taking away Central Government officers for interrogation. The Minister categorically stated that no permission was required.

My friend Shri Makwana is now on the Treasury Bench as a Minister. He is an affable boy. When he was on this side, in similar circumstances, Shri Makwana complained that while he was returning after a party meeting somebody apprehended him, etc. We believed him and we supported him and cautioned the Government that they should be more careful in dealing with Members of Parliament and told them not to give them any threat. But here, what has happened? The same Shri Makwana called Mr. Advani a Goebbels. Goebbels is not on our side. Goebbels is on the other side. New facts have come out in the news that Mrs. Indira Gandhi intervened . . .

AN. HON. MEMBER: Under what law did she intervene?

SHRI ARVIND GANESH KULKARNI: I have great respect for the Prime Minister. This news that has come out is totally false and the Goebbell sitting in the Government has spread the news to get the story circulated as if we, Members of the

opposition, have nothing to do with this question. In this connection, I would only bring to the notice of the Government through you what appeared in the *Indian Express* and other papers to the effect that the senior officers are not only demoralised, but their wives went to the house of the CBI officer who was arrested and wept saying that the emergency has come back. I would request you to see that the privilege motion we have moved on behalf of our Party is admitted.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): I only want to point out that I am rather surprised to see that even after all these things those sitting on the benches on that side are laughing at this matter. They must have some sense of conscience. They must feel perturbed if they have an iota of conscience left in them.

SHRI GIAN CHAND TOTU: You better take care of your own conscience.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: If they have an iota of conscience or respect for democracy, they must be simply perturbed and they must ask for an inquiry about it.

Quite apart from that, the point is this. Yesterday we raised the matter through a Special Mention and for a matter raised through a Special Mention the Minister is not required to reply, under the rules. But the Minister himself volunteered to reply and give the information. What does it show? It shows that if what was alleged yesterday was true, the Minister knew that that there was an atrocious thing, it was an illegal thing and it was an atrocity. Therefore, he said that he was not arrested. Not only did he say that he was not arrested, but they also said that all the procedures have been followed. He quoted the C.R. P. and the Criminal Procedure Code. I pity him that he does not know the distinction between the C.R.P. and the Criminal Procedure

Code . . . (Interruptions) Anyway, I do not want to bother about that. Under the Criminal Procedure Code, if a person is wanted to be interrogated, if he is required to be interrogated, a police officer can go to his house and request him to come to the police station. He can be interrogated there and he can be asked to come to the police station. If I do not choose to go to the police station, he can issue a notice to me saying that you are required under section so and so to be interrogated please be present in the police station. This is the procedure under the Criminal Procedure Code . . . (Interruptions) Please don't interrupt. This is the procedure under the Criminal Procedure Code if one is required for interrogation. I want to know why such a big posse of police constables, lorries and other things were taken to his house if he was merely required for interrogation. Therefore, the whole thing is a string of lies. From beginning to end, it was a string of lies. They were not required to give a reply at that point of time. They could have said: All right, we shall enquire into the matter. Instead of that, they deliberately told the House that he has not been arrested, he has not been apprehended, and that all procedures under the law of the land have been fully followed. So this is completely a string of lies. Therefore, this matter must go to the Privileges Committee, because it has been deliberately done. It has been deliberately done for the purpose of misleading the House. Therefore, Sir, I want that this privilege motion must go to the Privileges Committee. Or, if you like. I would even press that it can be discussed here itself, in the House itself. The House itself can discuss the whole question. . . (Interruptions) and it need not go to the Committee. You allow us a complete discussion here to meet out the punishment that is due to the erring man.

SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND (Punjab): Sir, there was a Special Mention. Normally, a Special Mention is made through the Chair to

draw attention to an urgent matter and no answer is required. Now, the hon. Minister of State, Shri Makwana, wanted to give an answer, and we co-operated. In the meantime, the Home Minister came in. While Shri Makwana was trying to reply, the Home Minister himself got up to reply. I was expecting that perhaps the information in the possession of Shri Advani is not very correct, and perhaps the whole matter will blow over when Shri Makwana or Giani Zail Singh will come out with true facts. What did they come out with? They came out with a statement that Mr. N. K. Singh was not arrested. Then the hon. Chairman, who was occupying the Chair then, pointedly asked that Shri Advani, in the beginning, had not raised the question of arrest only, and that he had also raised the question of arrest or joining any investigation or physical removal. Then again, they did not answer. They tried to hide behind the technicality, the technicality being that the person was not arrested. Now, what are the facts? Sir, the fact is that the gentleman was arrested under section 365(2), 342, 506 and 120B. This is the information that was given by the SHO, Gurgaon, to the Press that he has been arrested thus. Then, when he was pointedly asked whether they have followed the legal procedure, he said that everything has been done legally. Then, there is another remark: This is Haryana, not Delhi; there is a lot of difference. What difference is there? Is it that it was used to be run by Bansilal and now it is Bhajan Lal? It has come out clearly that he was released on a personal bond of Rs. 2,000/-. Here is a statement come out—and this statement is by the UNI carried on behalf of the Government—that the Centre's consent is not required for any State Government to arrest any of its officials. This direction was denied by the Prime Minister, according to this news story. If the permission was denied by the Prime Minister, how the arrest was

[Shri Jagjit Singh Anand] affected. The story goes that the police went to his house at 5.30 A.M. at his old address. (Interruptions) Our charge is that the shadows of emergency are already thickening the way the story is covered in the press. They did not find him there. Then they went to his other residence at about 9.30. The gentleman went on saying that he should be permitted to seek the permission of his seniors. He is a Government officer. He was denied the right to contact his seniors before he was taken away. So, Sir, there was no need for the intervention of Shri Makwana and Shri Zail Singh. There was no need for them to come forward and speak. Or they could have said that they were seized with the matter, that they were thankful to the Members who had mentioned this thing and that they would find out the facts and place them before the House. Therefore, they have deliberately tried to mislead the House about an arrest which was effected and which reminds us very much of the emergency days by the manner of going at 5.30 in the morning and by refusing to allow him to contact his seniors. Then the SHO reminding us of the days of Bansilal said: "This is Haryana. This is not Delhi". After that, he charged him with all these sections. Then it is said that the Prime Minister had not permitted the arrest. If the Prime Minister had not permitted, then why all these sections are there and why the personal bond of Rs. 2000/- is there. So, it is very, very clear example of reverting to the old days. We thought that they had learnt some lesson from the past. I would be very happy if the Prime Minister had really learnt. The Prime Minister talked about cooperation in the very first days. What is being done is something that highly disturbs everybody. We want this nation to function according to normal democratic norms. Both the Home Minister and the Minister of State in the Home Ministry have gone out of their way. They could have observed

silence. They could have said that they are collecting information. But they have gone out of their way. This is a very grave matter of privilege and it should be sent to the Privileges Committee. Otherwise, it should be discussed in the House.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV: On a point of order. First of all, Shri Ramamurti said that no Minister was called upon to reply to a Special Mention. This has been a practice in this House. The Members always insist and sometimes the Ministers also come forward with ready replies. There was nothing unprecedented. I am sorry that Mr. Ramamurti who is a senior Member of this House, has said it. My second point is that what is appearing in the press through UNI and others is irrelevant. Until and unless you give permission under Rule 187, it cannot be raised. Therefore, this discussion cannot take place. First of all, you have to grant permission. If you allow a discussion, then we should also be heard.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to reply to the point of order. (Interruptions) Among other things, the point raised is as to why this discussion is being raised. As I have said in the beginning, only those Members who had given notice for Motion of Privilege are being allowed to make some observations. Everybody is not being permitted.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : उपसभापति महोदय, बिलकुल स्पष्ट सबसे पहले मै इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में छपी हेड लाइन्स पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ—

"CBI Investigator in Kissa Kursi Ka case arrested and released on bail".

(Interruptions)

श्रीमन्, श्री एन० के० सिंह की गिरफ्तारी उनके घर पर उनके डेरे पर हुई। मंत्री महोदय ने, छोटे और बड़े दोनों ने बयान दिया कि 12

बजे के करीब हमने हरियाना सरकार से संबंध जोड़ा है, पता लगाया है कि वे अरेस्ट नहीं हुए हैं। वे अरेस्ट नहीं हुए हैं, वे गिरफ्तार नहीं हुए हैं। उपसभापति महोदय, इससे बिल्कुल साफ है कि ये दोनों मंत्री सदन को गुमराह कह रहे थे। 10 बजे गिरफ्तार हुए। 5.30 बजे पुलिस वाले पहुंच गये थे और 10 बजे गिरफ्तार हुये। 12 बजे यहां स्टेटमेंट देते हैं कि पता लगाने पर यह मालूम हुआ। इस तरह उन्होंने सदन को मिस-लीड करने का काम किया है।

दूसरी बात उपसभापति महोदय, जग श्री एन० के० सिंह ने कहा कि मैं यूनिन टैरेटरी को छोड़कर नहीं जा सकता हूं बिना अपने डायरेक्टर की इजाजत से। उन्होंने कहा कि” . . . . .

“that he could leave the Union Territory without the consent of the CBI Director was also ignored.”

उन्होंने कहा कि आप हमारे साथ आ जाइये क्यों झमेला करते हैं कानून हमारे साथ में हैं आप बेकार चिंता कर रहे हैं; वहां पर पब्लिक और फोटोग्राफर जो था उसको भी भगा दिया कि आप आये क्यों? अब प्रेस वाले लोग आप सजग हो जायें। उप-सभापति महोदय, स्पष्ट है कि दोनों मंत्रियों ने, तमाम सब के सब गोबर गणेश लोग हैं, यह तो मानी हुई बात है, ये दोनों मंत्री जो हैं उन्होंने सदन को गुमराह किया है और इससे साफ जाहिर होता है कि इमरजेंसी के दिन आ रहे हैं। हम लोगों ने पहले भी कहा कि इंदिरा गांधी आयेंगी इमरजेंसी लायेंगी। इंदिरा गांधी आई है और उसकी शुरुआत हो गई है। सारे देश को सजग हो जाना है कि तमाम तैयारियां हो रही हैं। इस तरह की खबरें जा रही हैं, टेलीग्राफ जा रहे हैं कि लिस्ट तैयार करें। इसलिये ये एक गम्भीर मामला है। इसलिये मेरा आपसे निवेदन है कि जनतंत्र को बचाने के लिये आप इस इश्यू को मंजूर करें ताकि यह मामला प्रिविलेज कमेटी को सौंपा जाये। दोनों मंत्रियों

को कैबिनेट से निकाला जाना चाहिए, दोनों निकम्मे हैं।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As I said earlier . . .

श्री जगदीश आसाद माडुर (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय अखबारों में भी आया है और जो मेम्बरान बोलें हैं उन्होंने भी यह सवाल खड़ा किया है। श्री आनन्द जी ने कहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने इंटरवीन किया। यह इतना महत्वपूर्ण विषय है कि प्रधान मंत्री अथवा लीडर आफ दि हाउस यह बतायें कि प्रधान मंत्री ने इंटरवीन किस प्रकार किया और किस अधिकार से किया और क्यों किया? प्रधान मंत्री जी को स्वयं आकर सदन के सामने इस बात का स्पष्टीकरण करना चाहिए कि उन्होंने किस प्रकार से और किस अधिकार से यह किया। इसलिये मैं आपके माध्यम से इस बात की मांग करना चाहता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी स्वयं आयें और अपना बयान दें कि उन्होंने इंटरवीन क्यों किया। मेरा संदेह है कि उन्होंने मामले को साफ करने के लिए नहीं बल्कि कठोर बनाने के लिये इंटरवीन किया।

(Interruptions)

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : माधुर जी कैसे बोल सकते हैं ?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please.

श्री कलराज मिश्र : उत्तर प्रदेश उपसभापति महोदय . . . . .

श्री उपसभापति : मैं पहले ही निवेदन कर चुका हूं कि इस पर बहस नहीं होगी।

श्री कलराज मिश्र : . यह . . . .

श्री उपसभापति : रिकार्ड में नहीं जायेगा। मैं पहले ही बोल चुका हूं कि इस पर बहस नहीं होगी।



(Shri Kalraj Mishra continued to speak).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As I said earlier, only the Members who had given notice for Privilege Motions had been allowed to make certain observations. And as I said earlier, I would say that all the Motions are under the consideration of the Chairman and due action will be taken on them. Now, we pass on to the next item.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM: Sir, under rule 197...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not invoked at this stage. (*Interruptions*) Order, please. Now the Papers to be laid on the Table.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

**Various Annual Reports and Accounts of various public sector undertakings and related papers**

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL RECONSTRUCTION (RAO BIRENDRA SINGH): Sir, I lay on the Table:

I. A copy (in English and Hindi) of the Fourteenth Annual Report and Accounts of the Food Corporation of India, New Delhi, for the year 1977-78, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts and the Comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India thereon, under sub-section (2) of section 35 of the Food Corporations Act, 1964. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-82/80].

II. A copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following papers, under sub-section (11) of section 31 of the Warehousing Corporations Act, 1962:-

(i) Twenty-second Annual Report and Accounts of the Central Warehousing Corporation, New Delhi, for the year 1978-79, together with the Auditor's Report on the Accounts.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Corporation. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-88/80 for (i) and (ii)].

III. A copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following papers, under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956:-

(i) Thirteenth Annual Report and Accounts of the Modern Bakeries (India) Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1977-78, together with the Auditors' Report on the Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India thereon.

(ii) Review by Government on the working of the Company. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-186/80 for (i) and (ii)].

IV. A copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following papers:-

(i) (a) Annual Report of the Development Council for the Sugar Industry for the year 1978-79, together with a statement by Government accepting the Report, under sub-section (4) of section 7 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951.

(b) Memorandum explaining the reasons for the delay in laying the Report mentioned at (a) above.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-202/80 for (a) and (b)].

(ii) Explanatory Memorandum giving reasons for not laying the Annual Report of the Food Corporation of India, for the year 1978-79, within the stipulated period. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-206/80].

**Report (1978) of the Committee on Land Reforms and related papers**

RAO BIRENDRA SINGH: Sir, I also beg to lay on the Table a copy (in Hindi) of the Report (1978) of the Committee on Land Reforms, together with a statement (in Hindi) giving reasons for the delay in laying