

[श्री राजनारायण]

करना किसी भी जम्हूरी व्यवस्था में यकीन रखने वाली सरकार का कर्तव्य नहीं हो सकता। इसलिये यह सरकार तानाशाही है, अधिनायक-शाही है। इस सरकार ने जनतंत्री मान्यताओं को नष्ट कर दिया है। हमारा इस सरकार में कानिक भी विश्वास नहीं रह गया है। इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि सी० बी० आई० की रिपोर्ट सब से पहले इस सदन में आए।

DEMAND FOR DIRECT AIR SERVICE BETWEEN DELHI AND BHUBANESWAR

SHRI B. C. MAHANTI (Orissa): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, Orissa is one of the few States of the Union the capital of which, Bhubaneswar, is not directly linked by air with the Capital of the country. If you have to go to Bhubaneswar, you have to catch a plane from Delhi, stop for three hours, according to previous time-schedule, at Dum Dum airport, and then catch the plane which touches Bhubaneswar while going to Vizag. The same plane comes back and takes the passengers from Bhubaneswar airport to Dum Dum where formerly, till the 31st of October, the arrangement was in a way good, in the sense that the Bhubaneswar plane left Bhubaneswar airport at about 4-15 p.m. and it takes one hour and fifteen minutes to reach Dum Dum, and plane No. 402 used to be in waiting there and the passengers alighting from the Bhubaneswar plane would board that plane. We the people of Orissa with the support of the Government of Orissa were asking for a direct air service from the capital of the country to the capital of the State. We have, for the last two years, been given the hope that a Boeing service will be put into operation—Delhi—Varanasi-Bhubaneswar and back.

That was not done. On the contrary, from the 1st of November, things have been made much worse in the sense that the time schedule has been *changed*. The Vizag-Bhubaneswar and Dum Dum plane reaches Bhubaneswar one hour after, as a result of which the plane No. 402 which leaves Dum Dum airport at about 5-30 P.M. will not be able to take passengers coming from Bhubaneswar who will reach later than 5-30 P.M. The result is, one has to stop at Calcutta for the whole night. About the accommodation at the Dum Dum airport, the least said about it, the better.

AN HON. MEMBER: Food also.

SHRI B. C. MAHANTI: Very few of these passengers from Orissa have got their relatives in the city of Calcutta. Either they have to stay at the airport or go to some hotel. And staying in a hotel in Calcutta, you know how very costly it is apart from the fact that one has to go to the Calcutta city and come back again to the airport which means an expenditure of Rs. 30 to Rs. 35 on the taxi. During the past 4 to 5 months another plane has been put into operation from Dum Dum to Delhi but that leaves Dum Dum at about 7.55 P.M. as per the time schedule but we know—and it is everybody's experience; it must be your experience also—this Indian Airlines service is regularly irregular in take-off and in landing. That means, this plane never starts before 8-15 or 8-30 P.M. Now in this winter when it takes 2 hours from Dum Dum to reach Delhi, if you reach Delhi at 10-30 or at 10-45 P.M. and spend another half an hour or 45 minutes for the baggage to be unloaded, one is free only at 11 O'clock. And in this winter either one has to stay at the Delhi Airport itself or take the risk of taking a taxi to go to the city. I say 'risk' in the sense that travelling in Delhi these days at dead of night by a taxi is rather risky. I, therefore, bring this to your notice.

with the request that the old timetable of the Vizag-Bhubaneswar—Dum Dum planes be restored so that it will facilitate matters so far as the passengers from Bhubaneswar are concerned

श्री रवी राय (उड़ीसा) : उपाध्यक्ष
सहोदय, हम भरत महन्ती की बात का समर्थन
करते हैं ।

**RE. DISCUSSION IN THE
MATTER OF ISSUE OF IMPORT
LICENCE TO CERTAIN PARTIES OF
YANAM AND MAHE**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Niren Ghosh, you start discussion under Rule 176.

SHRI SALIL KUMAR GANGULI (West Bengal): Point of order, Sir.

श्री बनारसीदास (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
पहले सी० बी० आई० की रिपोर्ट पेश की
जाय ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I call Mr. Ganguli, who is on a point of order.

SHRI SALIL KUMAR GANGULI: My point of order is this. In the course of the discussions, the hon. Chairman has allowed that questions will be asked with regard to the contents of the C.B.I. report. The Government is taking a stand that this C.B.I. report will not be placed on the Table of the House. Now, Sir, I want to know what would be the procedure with regard to this because the Government is taking the plea that since the matter is sub-judice, they are not in a position to place the report on the Table of the House. I want to draw your attention to the provisions of the Constitution and the provisions of the criminal law and the rulings of the Supreme Court which clearly lay down that parallel enquiry is permissible, particularly so when the offences committed may be in the course of the

same transactions and may lead to different punishments for different kinds of offences. One is against Parliament and the other is against the ordinary law of the land. Now, Sir, in the course of discussion questions will be asked as to the propriety or admissibility of a question and you will be governed by the provision in the rules that the question shall not ask for information on a matter which is under adjudication by a court of law having jurisdiction in any part of India. Now, I want to point out that no court of law has jurisdiction over a breach of privilege of Parliament, misleading Parliament and this question relates to parliamentary privilege. Therefore, the question of taking shelter behind sub-judice does not arise at all. Now, the courts of law have no jurisdiction over Parliament. Parliament having exclusive jurisdiction, in the course of discussion if the Government refuses to place the report on the Table, which is the crucial basis on which the entire discussion rests, will it not amount to contempt of the House, breach of privilege of the House, and an unreasonable refusal on the part of Government to answer proper Questions put by Members? That is my question.. I want a ruling from you on this point.

SHRI D. D. PURI (Haryana): Sir, this matter seems to have come up before this House as far back as the 26th February, 1965. . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN (Uttar Pradesh): That was a different thing.

SHRI D. D. PURI: If you will kindly Permit me....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please go ahead.

SHRI D. D. PURI: It was very different because the person in that case was the hon. Shri Biju Patnaik. So, it is completely different. I agree with Mr. Rajnarain.