

RAJYA SABHA

Monday, the 7th September, 1970/the
16th Bhadra, 1892 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the clock.
MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

REFERENCE TO NOTICES REGARD- ING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST SHRI RAMNATH GOENKA

MR. CHAIRMAN : Before I take up the business on the Agenda; I want to dispose of some notices of breach of privilege. I wish to hear those honourable Members who have given notices, or some of them, in order to make up my mind as to whether I should give consent to adopt, the language of the rule to a motion for breach of privilege. I am not yet giving my consent. I am inviting those who have given me notices just to speak briefly so that I may be able to make up my mind on that question.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan) : On that before you begin, I would like to say something

मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि आप यह मैट्रिक्स प्रिविलेज आफ दि हाउस का, ब्रीच आफ प्रिविलेज का, है या नहीं इसी की मेरिट्स में जाँगें या आप उन सारे ईश्यूज को यहां डिसकस करवाने की इजाजत देंगे जिनमें से यह सब हुआ है क्योंकि मैं ऐसा ममझता हूँ कि आपके निर्णय के बाद प्रिविलेजेज कमेटी भी कुछ काम रखती है। मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि आप केवल प्राइमफेसी यह केस प्रिविलेजेज कमेटी में जाने का है या नहीं इसी पर विचार महदूद करवायें और जो काम प्रिविलेजेज कमेटी करने वाली है अगर वह ईश्यूज यहां इस सारे विवाद में प्रारम्भ हुआ तो मुझे भय है कि यह सवाल जिस मसलहत से उठाया गया और उस दिन भी जो सवाल उठा वह केवल पब्लिसिटी पपज के लिये है, तो फिर विवाद का एक दूसरा असर हो जायगा और फिर आगे लिये कही भी उसके लिये रोकना कठिन हो जायगा।

इसलिये मैं चाहूंगा कि आप स्पष्ट रूप से यह कहें, क्योंकि उस दिन भी जब मैंने सवाल उठाया था तब आपने इंस्ट्रक्शन दी थी कि सबजुडिस होने के बाद उसके दायरे से बाहर ही चले लेकिन चीजें उसके दायरे के अन्दर गईं और वह चीजें जो यहां नहीं उठानी चाहिये थी वह आपकी सूचना के बावजूद भी यहां उठाई गई।

तो मैं यह चाहूंगा कि आप यह सूचना तय करते समय और इस पर विचार सुनते समय इसकी मर्यादायें निश्चित कर दें और स्ट्रिक्टली उन मर्यादाओं के बारे में पूरी निगरानी रखने के लिये मैं फिर से निवेदन करूंगा नहीं तो फिर आज एक एक शब्द पर टोकाटाकी होगी।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Mr. Chairman, your position is quite according to the rules. About this breach of privilege matter you have been right in saying that you would hear those honourable Members who have given notices as well as others, that is, those who wish to speak. On the basis of that you will make up your mind. As you know, you even have the power to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee or *suo motu*, you may also admit a motion straight on the floor of the House. It is for you to decide. If you think that the case is such as should go to the Privileges Committee, it is for you to decide. If you think that the case is such as can be taken up immediately, a motion could be admitted by you straightway and put it to the House; that also you can do. You may also reject the permission. All these three courses are open to you under the rules. Therefore, I think it is good that you are allowing both the supporters and the opponents, if there are any, to make their statements, and in the light of their statements you can decide in what manner this particular motion should be dealt with by this House, directly on the floor of the House or through the Privileges Committee. It is for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I want to make one observation with regard to what Shri Bhupesh Gupta has said. He has said that

[Mr. Chairman]

I shall hear the opponents also which is not correct. I have asked only the movers or some of the movers to make brief statements on the question whether there is a *prima facie* case for breach of privilege. I have already said that this I have done in order to enable me to reach a conclusion whether there is a *prima facie* case or not. I have not said 'opponents'.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh) : what is the subject-matter of discussion ?

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : If the breach of privilege relates to anything that was published in the newspapers, then I would say that it should have something to do with what is going on in the House. Otherwise, I do not think any breach of privilege will arise. In the first place if the breach of privilege has got something to do with the statement that is going to be made, then the statement should be made first and after that the Members have a right to say whether a breach of privilege has been committed or not . . .

(Interruptions)

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : वह एक दूसरा
सवाल है जिस पर डिसकस हो रहा है।

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : If there is no subject-matter on which a breach of privilege can arise, you should not admit it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : What is the matter that we are discussing ?

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal) : What is the issue ?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : You should ask somebody to raise the issue so that others will know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I raise the issue.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : How can he raise ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I want to know from Shri Tyagi whether he wants to proceed against any particular individual and, if so, against whom. His notice to me appeared to be vague.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY (Mysore) : Why don't you read it out ?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : I leave it to you and to the House. If the House is not interested, then let it be dropped. I refer you to the reply given on Monday last by my honourable friend Shri Raghunatha Reddy on the question of Shri Ramnath Goenka utilising the National Company's funds for the purpose of buying IISCO's shares. While giving the detailed reply, we were given to understand that the matter was *sub judice* and the matter was being inquired into and the case was going on. Two days later, we found a statement issued by Shri Ramnath Goenka. It is for you to see whether, it is a contempt or whether it is a question of privilege or not. The Minister makes a statement and on that a private party—Shri Ramnath Goenka who is my old personal friend—makes these observations. Thereby, even if he has committed a breach of privilege, I would not mind the case being inquired into by the Privileges Committee. After all, friendship does not mean that I should not do my duty. He says that the reply given by the Minister was absurd and maliciously misleading. Then he says that he is being prosecuted because of the critical attitude of the Indian Express against the Government. Well, if this is true, I would like to know, Sir, if one individual openly makes a statement, openly contradicting what the Minister himself has said,—it is really a serious question—who is right and who is wrong. If the Minister has committed a breach, well, it is a definite breach if a wrong reply has been given and if the reply is right, then the person who openly criticises the Minister has committed a breach of privilege. Therefore, I want you to decide and I want to lay this statement on the Table of the House so that you and the other Members might compare whether it deserves . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Whose statement is this ?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : I am not giving a statement. It is only a newspaper report.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : I am putting it on the Table so that Members might see whether a breach has been committed by this gentleman and if he is right, it could be known through a court of inquiry or whatever the procedure is. Then, the Minister should be taken to task. If the Minister has given a wrong reply to this House . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please listen to me now. I do not want that it should be laid on the Table. I have got the whole newspaper myself ; you have got just a cutting. I have read it. You need not put it before me.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : The question is, if the matter comes for discussion, how will the Members make up their mind if they have not seen this statement ? Then alone they can do it. . .

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Yes. But it is only when the question comes up. I have still to consider whether I should give my consent to the question coming up.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Sir, will you permit me to read it out ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is not necessary. You have given the substance of it. 'Malicious' is the crucial word. You have used it. Now, Mr. Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, I have given notice to move against Shri Ramnath Goenka and the "Indian Express" for publishing a statement of Shri Goenka in its issue dated the 4th September 1970. The purpose of my notice is quite limited. The very first sentence of the statement published in the "Indian Express" says that the statement of the Minister is maliciously misleading. This is enough, Mr. Chairman, to prove that this is against the prestige, dignity and decorum of this House.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : It may be true also. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, I shall very humbly request my

hon. friend on the other side to see that even if a Minister makes a false statement, it is for you, Mr. Chairman, or for a Member of this House to challenge the statement of a Minister. . . (Interruptions) Even if the statement is false, according to the parliamentary procedure, a Minister has got the right to correct it. But, no outsider. . . (Interruptions). Mr. Chairman, may I request Shri S. N. Mishra to control Shri C. D. Pande ? . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I would very much want Mr. Chandra Shekhar to be heard quietly. We may be able to appreciate the argument.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to submit was that even if a Minister makes a false statement, totally false statement, it is the right and privilege of any Member of this House to challenge this statement. No outsider, in any parliamentary democracy, has been authorised or has got the privilege to challenge the statement of a Minister or any Member. . . (Interruptions) If he wants to challenge it. . . (Interruptions) . . . If he wants to challenge it. . . (Interruption) If he wants to challenge it, the course open for him is to write to you to refer to the matter and if you think that any wrong has been done to person concerned, you can order for making necessary amendment in the House by the Minister concerned. Any reflection on the proceedings of the House by any outside person through any media is a breach of privilege, is against the dignity of the House and is a clear violation of the privilege. Only two words of the statement of Mr. Goenka are enough to prove that the statement of Mr. Goenka is in bad taste. I have nothing to add and I am not very much sensitive about it because a person behaving irresponsibly in the economic life of the country is not expected to be very responsible in making such utterances but I would urge upon you that you should take note of it. It is not a matter to be investigated by the Privileges Committee. It is a clear case. I do not want that Mr. Goenka should be brought before the bar

[Shri Chandra Shekhar]

of the House but I brought it before you only with the intention that if you think that it is a clear case of breach of privilege and Mr. Goenka, howsoever economically influential he might be, has no right to comment upon the statement of any Member of the House, whether he is a Minister or an individual Private Member. If you think that these words as have been quoted by Mr. Tyagi, are derogatory to the prestige of this House, that they are reflections on the proceedings of this House, then at least the minimum I shall expect from you is that Mr. Goenka should be warned or admonished and should be brought to his senses through your ruling and through your warning. When the case is clear under the rules of the House, it is not necessary to go to the Privileges Committee and in this case I shall not waste the time of the House. Hundreds and thousands of cases can be cited that no outsider has been allowed to challenge the statement of any Member in the House which has been made on the floor of the House. With these words, I urge upon you that in the name of the dignity, decorum and decency to prevail in the House you should take due care and I leave it to your good judgment that you should take the necessary steps to make amends and to warn such irresponsible people who go out of their way simply because they have so much economic arrogance and economic power in their hands.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मुझको इस सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना है।

श्री सभापति : मुझे जिन लोगों ने नोटिस भेजे हैं...

श्री राजनारायण : मैं तो अभी जेल से आ रहा हूँ, सुप्रीम कोर्ट के आर्डर से।

श्री सभापति : आप काम नहीं चलने देंगे।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं काम नहीं चलने दूंगा या आप या सदन के लोग नहीं चलने देंगे? श्रीमन्, हम भी इसके बारे में कुछ जानते हैं। मैं तो जेल से पुलिस एस्कोर्ट में सुप्रीम कोर्ट के विशेष आदेश से आ रहा हूँ, आप हमारी बात सुनिए।

श्री सभापति : हमारी बात समझिए।

श्री राजनारायण : हम खूब समझे हैं। यह रामनाथ गोयनका से सम्बन्धित प्रश्न है। जो मंत्री ने यहां पर बयान दिया था और जो रामनाथ गोयनका ने उस पर कहा है...

श्री सभापति : मेरी बात सुनिए। मैंने अभी तक यह तय नहीं किया है कि ब्रीच आफ प्रिविलेज के मोशन को अपनी रजामन्दी दू या नहीं।

श्री राजनारायण : तभी हमको बोलना जरूरी है। अगर आप कुछ तय कर लेंगे तो मैं बोल कर क्या करूंगा।

श्री सभापति : पहले सुनिए। जिन साहबों ने मुझे नोटिस दिए हैं प्रिविलेज के मैं उनको सुनना चाहता हूँ ताकि मुझे उनका केस अच्छी तरह से समझ में आ जाए, उसके बाद जब मैं कन्सेन्ट दे दू अपनी उसके बाद और साहबान को भी गालिबन मैं बुलाऊंगा, लेकिन इस वक्त नहीं बुलाऊंगा।

श्री राजनारायण : इसी अवसर पर मैं आपसे एक विनम्र निवेदन करता हूँ और आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से। मैं बहुत ही हैरत में पड़ता हूँ जब आप किसी प्रिविलेज के इशू को सदन में रखने देते हैं और फिर अपना निर्णय बाद में देते हैं। आज तक आपकी अध्यक्षता में, आपके सभापतित्व में इस गरीब को एक ऐसा मौका नहीं मिला जबकि उसके विशेषाधिकार के सवाल के लिए आप कहें कि तुम सदन में कह लो और हम सुनने के बाद निर्णय देंगे। यह हमको शिकायत करनी है। श्रीमन्, आप जानते हैं कि डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट ने बिलकुल बेहूदा आदेश की तह में तिहाड़ जेल में हमें बन्द करवाया, दो दिन तक हम आपके दरवाजे खटखटाते रहे, यहां सदन के सदस्यों ने कहा लेकिन आप उसको प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेजने के लिए तैयार नहीं हो रहे हैं और न तो हमको इस सदन में कहने दे रहे हैं।

श्री सभापति : इस का कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है इस से । जब तक सुप्रीम कोर्ट का फैसला नहीं आता तब तक मैं कुछ नहीं कह सकता ।

श्री राजनारायण : सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फैसले के बारे में मैं कुछ नहीं कर रहा हूँ । मैं जिलाधीश के बेहूदे आदेश के बारे में कह रहा हूँ जो लखनऊ का मैजिस्ट्रेट है ।

श्री सभापति : मैं इस की इजाजत नहीं देता ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप न दीजिए । जब आप एक घंटा ले सकते हैं एक रिजल्ट के एनाउन्स करने में तो मैं समझ गया कि आप हम को कितना इजाजत देंगे । मैं ने राम नाथ गोयन्का का बयान भी पढ़ा है . . .

श्री सभापति : मैं ने दूसरे साहब को बुलाया है ।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : मेरिट्स में मैं नहीं जाना चाहता । ज्यादा से ज्यादा कांस्टीट्यूशनल प्वाइंट को चन्द्रशेखर जी ने उठाया है उस पर हम विचार कर सकते हैं । तो अगर आप मुझे कभी भी इजाजत दें तो मैं उस कांस्टीट्यूशनल एस्पेक्ट पर अपनी बात कहना चाहूंगा ।

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is just a question of merits and demerits of the thing and that can be decided here and now. Constitution is not involved here. The issue is whether there is a *prima facie* case in this or not.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. D. PANDE : On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You should first call the hon. Members, who have given you notice of this thing, in the order in which their names appear, and not those, who have not given you this notice. Now Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has given no notice; yet you have allowed him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not speaking on this thing. . . .

SHRI C. D. PANDE : No, no, you cannot at all speak now. I am one of those who have given the notice and I should be allowed to have my say, Sir.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : On a point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My suggestion is a serious matter. Now Mr. Chandra Shekhar has put his case. It would no doubt fair if you can ask someone to prove that it is a wrong case. Every party should be given a chance to express its opinion on this matter, and then, after that, you may come to a conclusion, because it involved the entire House. I would not like that Mr. Pande should be shut out from speaking. He should certainly speak.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What about my point of order ?

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : My point of order is this. Mr. Chandra Shekhar has got every right to put forth his case for a Privilege Motion, but I would like to know whether he has got the right to discuss the character and conduct of anybody, especially of Mr. Goenka, who is not a member here. Mr. Chandra Shekhar, when he expressed his opinion, said that Mr. Goenka has behaved in an irresponsible manner in the economic life of the country.

I am not pleading for Mr. Goenka, nor am I his friend. But is it right to discuss about a man who is not represented in the House ? I want a ruling on this. Otherwise, how could people who are outside, could be defended ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. Shri K. V. Raghunatha Reddy.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : What happened to my notice ? You please hear me for one minute. You are allowing those who have not given the notice. I was the first to give notice and you told me that I will be given a chance. But you are giving the chance to those who have given no notice.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Supposing I don't... please sit down Mr. Pande.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Gujarat) : Mr. Pande has given you the notice. Why should he not be allowed to have his say on the matter ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I do not want your advocacy. I am hearing him. Supposing I do not find it necessary to hear you, I may not hear you.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : There are points which have not been covered by earlier speakers. My grounds are quite different from the grounds mentioned here. Therefore how do you make your decision ? I want to put the case as I conceive it.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Over this advice of yours you have called on Mr. Raghunatha Reddy to say something.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I withdraw that order. No more please. I am giving my ruling on this.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : No, no. How can you give your ruling now ? My grounds are quite different, I have a different view of the whole thing. The real question is the background of the case, the question put and the answer given, and then the Statement issued by Mr. Ramnath Goenka. Mr. Goenka in the first sentence has said that they are political views and that the organ that he is possessing holds certain political views. Then, he said...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh) : On a point of order. . . . I am on a point of order.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : The Chairman is not permitting you.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : How can you prevent me from raising a point of order ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I will call you.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : You have to call me also.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : In the statement he said that he believed that he was being persecuted because of the critical attitude of this paper. Now, everybody in this country knows that the jute press, the so-called jute press had been curbed.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, I do not want facts about it.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : There are two papers, the Indian Express and the Statesman. They are standing aloft and they are holding the banner of democracy. Because you could not bend him, because you could not break him, you want to bring forward these charges. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Reddy is in the habit of passing on information to his friends. I can challenge it. He passes on information to Mr. Chandra Shekhar and asks him to put questions. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : I do not want these facts.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Sometimes information, which is not called for, is given...

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I rise on a point of order...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I rise on a point of order. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. C. D. Pande, please sit down.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise on a point of order. Mr. C. D. Pande has made a very irresponsible statement. I was never involved in any question about Mr. Goenka...

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Not this, has many other questions.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Pande, you are not to decide. I know what Mr. C. D. Pande is. I never make statements about individual Members. I am never bothered about briefs from the Minister. At least Mr. C. D. Pande know it. If Mr. C. D. Pande wants this game to be started in this House, Mr. Chairman, and if you will permit it, I am ready to bring all facts about Mr. C. D. Pande...

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, no.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, equally Mr. C. D. Pande should be allowed to come out with facts about me. If your honour allows this game to be played, I shall leave it to Mr. S. N. Mishra. I may tell him that we are not interested in individuals. What has

provoked Mr. C. D. Pande to make such a reflection that I raise matters in the House at the instance of Ministers? Mr. Chairman, Sir, I feel deeply aggrieved and I think that Mr. C. D. Pande should withdraw such remarks. I am not in the habit of talking like that.

श्री पीताम्बर दास : मिस्टर चेयरमैन, मुझे जरा सी एक बात निवेदन करनी है . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : When will you call me, today or tomorrow?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I wish tomorrow, but I will call you today.

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : कायदा है कि जिसने नाम दिया है उसको पहले बुलाया जाता है, आप उसको नहीं बुलाते, न श्री सी० डी० पांडे का नाम है, न पीताम्बर दास जी का नाम है . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : You do not know it. He has given his name.

श्री पीताम्बर दास जो इसके बारे में क्या कहना चाहते हैं आप कहिये :

श्री पीताम्बर दास : श्रीमन्

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : What happened to Mr. C. D. Pande's remarks? I ask Mr. Pitamber Das to tell Mr. C. D. Pande to use his own judgment whether it is proper for any Member to say that he is asking all questions at the instigation of any Minister. This is a very serious matter. Mr. Chairman, I never indulge in such things and if anybody does such things to me, I want to take it to its logical conclusion. I should like to have your specific ruling whether Mr. C. D. Pande is allowed to make such irresponsible statements. Then, today or any day I am ready. Mr. C. D. Pande should be allowed to give all facts about me and I should be allowed to give all facts about him and, Mr. Chairman, Sir, I shall leave the whole matter to Mr. S. N. Mishra, the leader of his own party, to decide who is guided by whom. I urge upon you to come to some decision.

श्री पीताम्बर दास : सभापति महोदय, मुझे यह निवेदन करना है कि मा० चन्द्रशेखर जी ने जो अपने और सी० डी० पांडे के संबंध

में बात उठाई मैं उसको जान बूझ कर इसलिये नहीं कर रहा क्योंकि इस सारी बहस में जो उन्होंने शुरू में एक बात उठाई थी “क्लाऊड” हो रही है। मुझे तो सिर्फ उसी के बारे में निवेदन करना है। मेरी एक्जाइटी यह है कि कहीं उस असली बहस में इससे वह इश्यू क्लाऊड न हो जाये।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : मैं तो माननीय लीडर आफ अपोजिशन से यह जानना चाहता हूँ इस बारे में वह क्या कहना चाहते हैं। मैं पीताम्बर दास जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर लीडर आफ अपोजिशन इस बारे में कोई राय देना चाहते हैं तो अध्यक्ष महोदय, दें अन्यथा मैं प्रेस नहीं करता। मैं लीडर आफ अपोजिशन की बात जानना चाहता हूँ।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : श्रीमन्, इसमें एक वैधानिक आपत्ति चन्द्रशेखर जी ने उठाई है और उसके ऊपर विचार कर लेना आवश्यक है। मैं उनके विचार के लिये भी और आपके विचारार्थ भी एक बात रख देना चाहता हूँ और आपके द्वारा सबन के सारे माननीय सदस्यों के लिये भी; उनके यह कहने के बाद मैं थोड़ी देर के लिये अपने दिमाग से निकाल देता हूँ कि यह योग्यता का मामला है या कौन से मिनिस्टर का मामला है। उनका कहना यह था कि प्रेस में किसी ऐसे स्टेटमेन्ट के विरुद्ध जो इस हाऊस में दिया गया है अगर कोई बाहर का आदमी उसकी आलोचना कर दे या उसका प्रतिवाद कर दे तो सीधे-सीधे उसके ऊपर ऐक्शन ले लेना चाहिये। चेयरमैन साहब को मैं यह समझा कि उन्हें उनके बयान को प्रिविलेज कमेटी में ले जाने की जरूरत नहीं है।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : नहीं, जरा सुनिये। प्रतिवाद वह अगर करते तो मैं उस पर न कहता, अगर वह कहते स्टेटमेन्ट मिसलीडिंग है तो वह बात नहीं थी लेकिन उन्होंने कहा “मैलीशसली मिसलीडिंग”। यह तो ब्रीच आफ प्रिविलेज है।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : तो उसका अर्थ यह हो गया भाषा का प्रश्न है, भाव का प्रश्न नहीं है।

श्री कृष्ण कान्त : भाषा भाव को बताती है।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : जरा शान्ति से विचार कर लें। मेरे साथ दिक्कत यह है :

I am incapable of shouting physically as well as temperamentally.

शान्ति के साथ सुन सकते हैं तो मैं आपके सामने अपनी बात रख दूँ। भाव का प्रश्न नहीं है भाषा का प्रश्न है और भाषा इंडिविजुअल के ऊपर डिपेन्ड करती है। अगर मानो इस हाऊस के अन्दर कोई बात उसके संबंध में कही जाती है जो बाहर का है...

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : (उत्तर प्रदेश) : चेयरमैन साहब, पीताम्बर दास जी कह रहे हैं भाषा और भाव अलग अलग चीज हैं। भाषा और भाव अलग अलग चीज नहीं हैं। वह शोर पड़ते हैं, अच्छा खासा समझते हैं, ऐसी बात उनकी जवान में ठीक नहीं है।

श्री सभापति : मैंने आपको नहीं बुलाया है।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : श्रीमन्, मैं यह कह रहा था कि मानो कि इस हाऊस के अंदर कोई किसी बाहरी आदमी के बारे में कोई बात कह दी जाये, वह मैं कहूँ या मिनिस्टर कहें, इम्पेटिरियल है; लेकिन अगर कोई ऐसी बात कह दी जाये जो ठीक न हो तो वह आदमी उस मेरी बात को लेकर कोर्ट आफ ला में जाये तो जा नहीं सकता, क्योंकि हमने उसमें मनाही की है। श्री चन्द्रशेखर जी को मेरे खयाल से समझने में कुछ गलती रह गई है क्योंकि कोर्ट आफ ला में तो वह जा नहीं सकता है। बाहर का आदमी बैठा बैठा महसूस करता है तेरे बारे में कुछ बातें जानबूझ कर गलत कह दी गई है—कहने वाले ने ईमानदारी से कह दिया है—लेकिन वह महसूस करता है कि ये बातें बेदयानती

से कही गई हैं, एक फ्री कंट्री जहाँ कि पार्लियामेंट सुप्रीम है, वहाँ का नागरिक अगर यह महसूस करता है तेरे साथ न्याय नहीं हो रहा है तो क्या कोई भी रेमेडी नहीं है? और वह रेमेडी हमने यह प्रोवाइड की है कि वह बाहर का आदमी हाऊस की प्रिविलेज कमेटी को मूव कर सकता है यह बात हाऊस के अंदर कही गई है, इसके अंदर ऐक्शन लें। तो इस विषय को प्रिविलेज कमेटी को भेज दिया जाये, वहाँ सब मामला साफ हो जायेगा।

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : Sir, may I say this? Let the Leader of the Opposition also hear me and then say what he wants. Sir, so far as Shri Pitamber Das's statement is concerned, the point that this House has to consider is whether the freedom of every Member to express himself on the floor of the House without fear or favour is interfered with by any criticism outside. This is the point (*Interruption*) Kindly hear me. The point is not whether on a factual statement made here on the floor of the House other facts can be presented. But when that intention is attributed maliciously, then the freedom of the Member to express himself on the floor of the House is interfered with. Therefore, what is a question of the contempt of the House or what is a question of the privilege of the House is not the statement of fact, but whether a malicious intention is attributed to the Member of the House and thereby the freedom of expression is curtailed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now, Sir, you will hear one by one.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : It is only for this purpose that we have got the Privileges Committee.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : They want to pass on from the big capitalists to the princes.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : I want to make a submission. What is it about?

MR. CHAIRMAN : They are speaking on a point of order.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : If it is on a point of order we cannot proceed on a point of order.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA) : No, no, this only with reference to that; this is not a substantive point that I want to make. Sir, so far as the privilege is concerned, I would like to say only one word for your consideration. Since the hon. Leader of the House has said ...

MR. CHAIRMAN : You may reply to Shri Chandra Shekhar.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, the point where criticism ends and the contempt begins is very difficult to judge and therefore we have made a suggestion that this matter would be fully gone into by the Committee on Privileges. My submission would be that this should be considered. The two things, the statement made by the Minister and also the statement made by the person outside, these two things will have to ...

MR. CHAIRMAN : But ...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, please wait. Even if you have already made up to your mind, I have to make my submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, no.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Whatever the case may be, I have every right to make my submission with regard to the privileges also.

MR. CHAIRMAN : My only point is ...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Please wait. That much time which you give to any other Member, you cannot give to me ? This is something which just cannot be put up with.

Sir, about the second thing, to which my hon. friend, Shri Chandra Shekhar, referred and he addressed certain remarks to me, relates to certain hurtful expressions of my hon. friend, Dr. C. D. Pande. May I say that we are against the use of any strong words or scurrilous remarks against any other hon. Member ? Not only that. We want that here no hon. Member should make any remarks, any scurrilous remarks, even against any outsider. But may I say

with all humility, Mr. Chairman, that no outsider is getting protection at your hands ? I am only incidentally making a submission that no outsider also should be subjected to any kind of scurrilous remarks in our House. Whenever anything we say is being criticised outside, we take it as a matter of contempt or as a matter of privilege. But whenever any outside citizen says anything and we make all kinds of remarks against him, there is no protection for him. That is for you to bear in mind.

So far as this aspect of the matter is concerned—that hon. Members should not use any strong expressions against one another,—we want to follow it scrupulously. And may I say that I have not felt happy nor—I must say that—in sober moments, my friend Dr. Pande would have felt happy. But at the same time, I would like to remind the Members on the other side that they have been using very strong expressions against us and we have been silently bearing them without any protection from the Chair. I only leave it to their conscience to judge whether we should be subjected or our leaders, who do not happen to be in this House but who belong to the other House, should be subjected to very strong expressions. I leave it to their judgment, discretion and conscience. But I would say once again that we want to observe all norms.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I request you to deal with this matter because we do not know how to use language. People have their ideas, and I know this thing. I am here for using strong language in Parliament.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have not called you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You proceed with the matter. The matter is before you. Under Rule 219 ...

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have already spoken. Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not know where I am.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I know where you are.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Mr. Chairman, I leave it to your discretion ...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Tyagi, you have spoken.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sir, on a point of order...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Pande, I hope you do not insist on talking any further.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : No.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Krishan Kant. I will call you later, Mr. Arjun Arora. (Interruption by Shri Arjun Arora) All right. You speak.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Shall I speak on my point of order or on the subject ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : In what capacity is he speaking ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : He has also given notice. I am calling only the movers.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sir, I concede the right of any citizen of India to contradict any statement made by a Member of Parliament in the House. I concede the right of even Mr. Ramnath Goenka to challenge the correctness of a statement made in the House by a Minister, in this case, Mr. Raghunatha Reddy. But that contradiction and that challenge must be confined to a statement of fact. It should not attribute motives to the Minister or the Member of Parliament concerned. In this case, Mr. Ramnath Goenka has said that the statement of the Minister was "not only absurd but maliciously misleading". I concede the right of a citizen to call the statement of a Minister absurd. The Ministers do make absurd statements...

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Can you say this outside ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : ...But to attribute motive to a Minister or a Member of Parliament and—by chance, Ministers are also Members of Parliament—to attribute malice is a breach of privilege of the House. Mr. Ramnath Goenka and the Indian Express have not only attributed malice to the Minister, which is a breach of privilege, they have been more specific.

Sir, Mr. Ramnath Goenka has said, and the Indian Express has published the statement which says that the Minister had an ulterior motive in making that statement;

the motive has been defined and repeated here in this House by Shri C. D. Pande. The motive is that the Minister has made this absurd and misleading statement, according to Mr. Goenka and not according to me, because Mr. Ramnath Goenka and the chain of newspapers which he controls have been critical of certain aspects of the policies of the Government. So not only motive, not only malice has been attributed, ulterior motive has been attributed, and ulterior motive has been specifically mentioned in that statement.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : He might be able to substantiate it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not interrupt.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : So it is definitely a case of breach of privilege of the House. The statement published in this powerful chain of newspapers has created conditions in which Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, a Member of this House, will find it difficult to function without fear or favour. So, it is a clear case of breach of privilege *per se*. You may either give me consent to move a motion to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee or, as Mr. Chandra Shekhar has said, you might treat it as a case of breach of privilege *per se* and the House may decide how to deal with Mr. Ramnath Goenka and his chain of newspapers.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Krishan Kant, after what Mr. Arjun Arora has said, do you insist on saying something ?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Yes, Sir. The question before the House is very simple. We are not in any way saying that what Mr. Raghunatha Reddy has said is correct, or what Mr. Ramnath Goenka has said is correct. The question is one of imputation of motives in a parliamentary democracy. Mr. Pitamber Das asked what are the avenues open when such things happen. Mr. Chandra Shekhar raised the question of Birlast ...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please come to your point.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I am coming. It does not become a matter of privilege or condemnation of the House when it is spoken in a club or while talking to some-

body. But when it is written in a paper, it becomes derogatory. In "May's Parliamentary Practice", on page 124—Seventeenth Edition—it is said :

"written imputations as affecting a Member of Parliament may amount to breach of privilege."

If it had not been printed in the *Indian Express* and he had just said this to his friends, it would not have become a question of breach of privilege and degradation of the House. But when it is a written thing, according to "May's Parliamentary Practice", it certainly becomes a matter of breach of privilege. Mr. Raghunatha Reddy is not only a Minister, but is a member of the Rajya Sabha. If Mr. Goenka was really angry with the statement of Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, he could have asked his own friend, Mr. Tyagi, to raise this question in the House.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : I consider him to be a very old friend and a sincere friend.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : That is what I am saying. Mr. Tyagi himself could have raised this matter in this House that the statement by the Minister was not correct and it was misleading. That would have given him an opportunity to reply to whatever had been said. We are not in any way considering the facts of the matter. It is only a question of the dignity of Parliament and of this House. What has appeared in the paper is a very clear case of breach of privilege and it need not go to the Privileges Committee. You can yourself decide it and this House can condemn Mr. Goenka for what he has said. Mr. Charman, Sir, you did not allow that day questions about *sub judice* matters. But Mr. Goenka has in this statement referred to them. I do not want to go into these things. There are so many things. Now I can say that they are supporting him because he is in league with the Rajmata of Gwalior. But I am not saying it. He wants to control Parliament, the views of Members of Parliament the freedom of the Members of Parliament, by his money, big business and chain of newspapers. This is a very serious matter. It must be condemned.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Dharia, do you want to say something ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Yes, Sir.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman, I am raising a matter which not only affects one individual Member, Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, but is something far more serious. (Interruptions) We have also given notice. . .

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am not considering it. You have just now passed it on to me.

(Interruptions)

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN (Tamil Nadu) : The House is concerned.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am not considering any notice. (Interruptions)

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Sir, I would like to submit that others have already advanced their views and I do not want to repeat them. This statement "maliciously misleading" is *per se* a breach of privilege of the House and let us not permit this breach of privilege. Sir, without referring this matter to the Privileges Committee you can come to the conclusion that it amounts to a breach of privilege, and it is for the House to consider what should be done if you come to that conclusion. So I would request you to consider this aspect. When it is *per se* a serious breach of privilege, the matter should not be delayed. You can refer to the House itself whether it is *per se* a breach of privilege or not, and it is for this House to take a further decision. Therefore, may I request you to take a decision without wasting any time ? I would like to warn today that this statement is not only detrimental to Mr. Reddy but it is going to be detrimental to the privilege of Members of Parliament and all the Ministers to make statements which are just matters of fact. If Mr. Goenka or somebody else wants to gag the voice of the Members or Ministers by making use of the Press, it should not be tolerated and a serious view of this should be taken. Therefore, I would request you not to take further time and to ask this House to take the matter into consideration.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Sir, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I want to give my ruling now.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, यह क्या है, ट्रेजरी बैंक के लोग एक-एक कर के खड़े हो जायें और आप उनको बुलाते रहें।

श्रीमन्, मैंने श्री चन्द्र शेखर जी और श्री मोहन धारिया को.

श्री सभापति : क्या आपका कोई प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है।

श्री राजनारायण : जी हां, उसी घर आ रहा हूं।... और अपने मित्र श्री अरोड़ा साहब को बहुत ध्यान से सुना। मैं इस निश्चित मत का हूं कि यदि इस सदन में कोई मंत्री ऐसा वक्तव्य करे किसी आउट साइडर के सम्बन्ध में जिसको वह आउट-साइडर यह समझता है कि यह मैलिशन है, यह धूर्ततायी से भरा हुआ है, राग-द्वेषपूर्ण है, छल कपट दम्भपूर्ण है तो उसको यह कहने का कतई अधिकार है, मगर मैं समझता हूं कि जो व्यक्ति बाहर का यह कहेगा उसको यह साहस भी होना चाहिये कि वह प्रिविलेज कमेटी को फेस करे और प्रिविलेज कमेटी में इसको सिद्ध करे कि मंत्री ने जो कुछ कहा है मैं सिद्ध करना हूं कि मैलिशन है। मैं अब श्री रेड्डी साहब के ऊपर विशेषाधिकार की अवहेलना का प्रश्न उपस्थिति करता हूं, प्रस्तुत करता हूं, यह पढ़ कर कि एक व्यक्ति ने श्री रेड्डी के बयान के बारे में जो उन्होंने आदरणीय सदन में किया ऐसा कहा है कि उन्होंने गुमराह किया तो श्री रेड्डी के ऊपर भी विशेषाधिकार की अवहेलना का प्रश्न कोई सदस्य उठा सकता है इस बयान को पढ़ कर। श्री चन्द्र शेखर ने जो बात कही, मैं उनको बहुत मुबारकबाद देता हूं, कि अभी अभी यह मामला तय हो जाय। मंत्री अनाप-शनाप बकता चला जाय। मैं जानता हूं श्री रेड्डी को, मैं जानता हूं श्री

रेड्डी साहब कितने पानी में हैं और किस तरीके से कहां कितना देते हैं...

श्री सभापति : आप खत्म कीजिये। यह प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर नहीं है।

श्री राजनारायण : तो मैं सफाई के साथ इस समय श्री चन्द्र शेखर जी ने जो बात की है उसकी ताईद करूंगा और आपसे विनम्रता से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप इस मामले को विशेषाधिकार समिति को अवश्य, अवश्य, अवश्य, अवश्य अवश्य भेजें।... पांच बार हमने वैसा कहा है क्योंकि कोई मामूली आरोप गोयन्का साहब ने नहीं लगाया है। गोयन्का साहब ने आरोप लगाया है कि हमारा जो इन्डियन एक्सप्रेस पत्र है दैनिक, उसकी कुछ पालीसीज, जो गवर्नमेंट को गलत पौलीसीज को क्रिटिसाइज करने की है, उसके लिये हमको सफाया मिल रही है। यह उन्होंने आरोप में लिखा है। गोयन्का साहब ने बहुत ही इम्पार्टेंट, और इस मुल्क के जनतंत्र को बचाने के लिये बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विषय की ओर सरकार का ध्यान आकर्षित किया है। उन्होंने कहा कि चूंकि हमारा इंडियन एक्सप्रेस अखबार इस समय सरकार की गलत नीतियों के विरोध में कुछ न कुछ लिखता रहता है इसलिए रेड्डी साहब ने जान बूझकर सदन को धोका देकर मिसलीड किया, गुमराह किया और राग द्वेषपूर्ण ढंग से किया। हम आंकड़ों में नहीं जाना चाहते हैं। 4 करोड़ है, 12 करोड़ है...

श्री सभापति : अब आप बैठिये। यह प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर तो है नहीं।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् देखिये, मैं आपसे बार बार निवेदन करने का हक रखता हूं कि आपसे बार बार कहने की जरूरत पड़ती है क्योंकि आप शायद ममझते देर में हैं क्योंकि उस दिन बोट रिकार्डिंग के समय भी यह घटना घटी थी। बार बार हमने समझाया और आपने किया वही जो हमने

कहा। कुछ आप बलकुलेटेड होकर, गम्भीरता के साथ, फैसला लेते हैं। इसलिये हमें 2 मिनट कह लेने दीजिए क्योंकि हम आपको नहीं समझावें तो आप सही फैसला कैसे ले पायेंगे... देखिये यह कहते हैं...

श्री सभापति : अब मैंने यह सब पढ़ लिया है। उसको दोहराने में कोई फायदा नहीं है।

श्री राजनारायण : "Apart from the suggestion being absurd, it is maliciously misleading" एबसर्ड तो है ही और राग द्वेषपूर्ण ढंग से सदन को गुमराह करने वाला है। अगर गोयन्का की यह बात सही है तो गोयन्का को ईमानदारी के साथ प्रिविलेज कमेटी को फेंक करना चाहिये। भाई चन्द्रशेखर जी और मोहन धारिया और अर्जुन अरोड़ा को भी मैं कह दूँ, कभी-कभी उन्होंने सही बात कही है, "कभी-कभी" मैं कहता हूँ, कि उन्होंने सही बात कही। अगर कोई हमारे सदन के किसी माननीय सदस्य के लिये मैलिशसली शब्द का प्रयोग करता है तो क्या इस सदन का कोई सदस्य उठकर वह नहीं सकता ये रामनाथ गोयन्का सत्य है या मंत्री सत्य है। क्या कोई कह सकता है ?

श्री कृष्णकान्त : आप कह सकते हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं नहीं। देखिये, चरण सिंह ने आता तुमलकी फरमान निकाल दिया कि जो एग्जिस्टिंग एम० एल० ए०, एम० पी० विधान सभा के सदस्य हैं वही सुपीरियर क्लास पाए लैन्ड ग्रैंड मूवमेंट के सिलसिले में, और कोई नहीं। राम सागर विद्यार्थी, आर० के० गर्ग और रस्तम सातिन जो फूड मिनिस्टर भी रह चुके हैं : दे वेयर पुट इन आर्डिनरी क्लास।

MR. CHAIRMAN : What are you saying how? Please sit down.

श्री राजनारायण : देखिए, चरण सिंह का सर्कुलर आता है...

श्री सभापति : अब खत्म करो। बहुत हो गया।

श्री राजनारायण : एम० पी० के लिये क्यों खास...

श्री कृष्णकान्त : आपके मेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट होने से सर्टेन प्रिविलेज है।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Rajnarain, you are taking too much time.

श्री राजनारायण : अच्छा एक मिनट और दीजिए। सावरेनिटी, प्रभुसत्ता, सन्निहित है देश की जनता में, हम जनता के प्रतिनिधि हैं, जनता हमारी मालिक है। मोहन धारिया के सजेशन के मैं कतई खिलाफ हूँ।

श्री सभापति : अब आप बैठ जाइये।

श्री राजनारायण : मोहन धारिया एक ऐसा सजेशन दे रहे हैं जो जनतंत्री इतिहास में अनूहर्ष है। कहते हैं आप फैसला कर दीजिए, न चाहे तो हाऊस के सुपुर्द कर दीजिए। तो क्या हाऊस राम नाथ गोयन्का को सुनेगा। यह उनके सजेशन को मूर्तिमान रूप दिया जायेगा तो बिना रामनाथ गोयन्का को सुने बहुमत से यह हाऊस क्या फैसला कर दे। यह बिलकुल लगेगा होगा।

श्री सभापति : अब आप बैठ जाइये।

12 NOON

श्री राजनारायण : इसलिए आप से प्रार्थना है, विनती है हाथ जोड़कर कि आप श्री चन्द्र शेखर के साधु प्रस्ताव को प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेज दीजिए। श्री चन्द्र शेखर का प्रस्ताव अब सदन में पेश हो गया है और हम सब लोग श्री चन्द्र शेखर के साथ हैं। हमारा यह सजेशन है कि अगर श्री चन्द्र शेखर उठायें तो तब मैं यह कहूँगा कि श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी के विरुद्ध विशेषाधिकार अवहेलना का प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत करता हूँ क्योंकि उन्होंने मैलिशस ऐसा कहा श्री राम नाथ गोयन्का के बयान के मुताबिक। (Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : He is speaking on behalf of Shri Ramnath Goenka.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : I am speaking on behalf of justice. I am speaking on behalf of truth, commonsense and parliamentary practice.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि... उडावन फूकी पहाड़ा, ये कहाड़ को पढ़ाना चाहते हैं श्री राम नाथ का नाम लेकर ।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : अगर श्री राम नाथ गोयन्का ने गलत बयान दिया है । या (Interruptions)

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : श्री राजनारायण जी अपने ऊपर यह जिम्मेदारी लें कि वे श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी के स्टेटमेंट को मिसलीडिंग और मैलिशश साबित कर देंगे या फिर श्री राजनारायण जी खुद कहें कि श्री राम नाथ गोयन्का ने जो स्टेटमेंट दिया है वह सही है । अगर श्री राजनारायण जी इस तथ्य पर चलते हैं तब तो उन्हें यह अधिकार है । (Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् ।

श्री सभापति : आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप ने जब उनको सुना तो हमको भी जवाब देने का अधिकार है ।

श्री सभापति : अब आप बैठ जाइये ।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं श्री चन्द्र शेखर की तारीफ करता हूँ कि उन्होंने बहुत थोड़े समय में पार्लियामेंटरी प्रैक्टिस अच्छी सीख ली है । श्रीमन्, राजनारायण कहता है कि श्री गोयन्का के हाथ हमारी भेंट नहीं हुई और न ही हमने उन से सफाई ली है ।

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : आपने कहा कि हम उनके बयान की सत्यता को जानते हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : हरगिज नहीं । (Interruptions) श्रीमन्, मैं श्री गोयन्का को नहीं

जानता हूँ मगर श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी को जानता हूँ । इस संबंध में उन्होंने क्या कहा और अन्य दूसरी बातों के बारे में भी मैं उनकी नस-नस जानता हूँ और कहाँ-कहाँ उनका मामला इन्वाल्व है । श्री चन्द्र शेखर यह कहना चाहते हैं या नहीं कहना चाहते हैं लेकिन श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी अनाप-शनाप बकवास करने में माहिर हैं । इसलिए यह कहना कि श्री राम नाथ गोयन्का सही है या श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी सही है, इस मामले को प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेज दिया जाय ।

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : On a point of order, Sir.

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : श्रीमन्, अगर कोई सदस्य श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज लाएगा तो उसको यह कहना पड़ेगा कि वह श्री राम नाथ गोयन्का के वक्तव्य की सत्यता को प्रमाणित करता है और श्री राम नाथ गोयन्का के विश्वास के ऊपर इस सदन में बोल रहा है । अगर श्री राजनारायण यह वक्तव्य दें तब तो उन्हें पुनः अधिकार है अन्यथा नहीं ।

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मुझे पूरा अधिकार है कि अगर एक नागरिक मंत्री के बयान को गलत, मैलिशश और मिसलीडिंग बतलाता है तो ऐसे स्थिति में इस प्रश्न को प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेजा जाना चाहिए ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. Otherwise I will stop the proceedings and adjourn the House. What you say hereafter will not be recorded.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is your point of order, Mr. Chatterjee.

MR. A. P. CHATTERJEE : Sir, my point of order is simple and is in regard to the procedure. Sir, as far as the question of reflection on the Member of the House is concerned, there is no question at all that this is a breach of privilege. There is no

doubt about it. But, I am drawing your attention to Rule 190 and Rule 191.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have read it. I have got it.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Will you kindly allow me also ? You have read it. Now, as far as Rule 190 is concerned, if it is a motion of privilege, the person giving notice of privilege rises in this seat and makes a statement. That statement has already been done.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, not done. Please sit down, Mr. Chatterjee.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Why Sir ? You have allowed all these persons. Now, you allow me...

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : All right, you go on.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : Sir, what I am asking you is this : I do not know how the proceedings of the House are being conducted. I went to your Chamber in the morning to raise certain very important questions in regard to West Bengal and you did not allow me to raise the questions on the ground that the business of the House is very heavy. Now, if you have not even allowed a notice of privilege being raised and if he is talking, if he goes on talking, I do not know how the business is heavy. Why did you not allow ... (Interruptions) ... us to make our submission before the proceedings of the House started ? I do not understand. For example, if you have to take a decision; you have to take a decision according to the rules of the House. If a motion has come, notice of privilege, according to Rule 190, the person concerned can make a statement according to the procedure under Rule 190. The House then decides, whether or not, it should be referred to the Committee of Privileges and it is the only way. This is not the way in which we can go on. After all, you said that the business of the House is heavy. Then, if you want to go on with this ... (Interruptions) ... I shall insist on my right to raise a question in regard to West Bengal here and now. I shall assert my right. ... (Interruptions).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What all we request you, Sir ... (Interruptions) ... I wish to make a submission.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, I would like to know a specific thing : Are there two categories of Members in this House, one belonging to the special category and the other to the ordinary category ? I have a great grievance ... (Interruptions). I have been rising innumerable times and they are not taken notice of. The other day, I wanted to record my protest because my party, consisting of 13 Members, was not given time. I was prevented from speaking ... (Interruptions) ... Because you do not want to hear a particular type of speech, you are preventing people from speaking. You appreciate a particular type of speech. Therefore, you ask people to set up and speak ... (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please ...

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Because my feelings are so much hurt ... because I have been rebelling against it. I told you in the Chamber that I have been rebelling inside myself and that is why I wanted to give expression to it. Unless justice is administered in this House, hereafter it will be impossible to function in this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, I yielded to my friend, because he is certainly entitled to speak and I hope you will allow me to make my further suggestions ...

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I ask you ...

(Interruptions)

श्री सुन्दर सिंह मंडारी : ये लोग खड़े होते हैं तब इनको भी तो मना करिए, जब दूसरे खड़े होते हैं तब उनको आप मना करते हैं।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No, I am not going to sit ... (Interruptions). Now, when I get up, he has got up. ... Let him speak. All right, let him speak. ... (Interruptions).

Ram Nath Goenka

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Sir, you wanted certain suggestions. If a Member has to give suggestions half a dozen times and if you are prepared to hear him, why do you shut others also? ... (Interruptions). Then allow everybody. To some you say 'No' and if somebody gets up six times, you do not say...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not getting up ... (Interruptions). It cannot go on like this. I was not objecting to Shri Bhandari speaking, because his party is a party bigger party than mine in the House and he is certainly entitled to speak, entitled to precedence over me. But, he should not ...

(Interruptions)

The simple issue before you is whether you will give permission or not. You started with that. Under the rules you have the right. I even suggested that you hear even those who opposed it before you make up your mind because it is an important matter. It is a simple thing and over a matter like this party barriers or politics should not be brought. On such fundamental matters, we would like to protect that Members of the House irrespective of which party they belong to. The question is not whether one can criticise. Certainly a citizen of India can criticise a statement by Members on the floor of the House. I do not dispute it. It would be a sad day if the citizens are denied that right. They can even challenge that. The question is whether motives should be imputed and whether the word 'maliciously' can be used and repeated or not. If Mr Goenka has used certain other language which by inference says that somebody tried to make a malicious statement, I can understand but here he has clearly used the word 'malicious' in his own paper. At least he has not withdrawn it. The papers owned by Mr. Goenka have said that. If that is so it is *ipso facto* an act of...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Why should I sit down? I am following Shri Rajnarain always. I will not sit down because all that I want to say is Mr. Goenka does not deny that he has used the word 'maliciously'. Mr. Goenka has published his

statement in his own paper. When the matter is pending before you, he has not withdrawn that statement. Therefore, if this kind of a statement is not *prima facie* proven breach of privilege, I do not know which is. The only thing that remains to be done by you is to permit us to move the motion. I do not think it should go before the Privileges Committee. A simple motion of condemnation of this action will serve the purpose. Here I agree with Shri Rajnarain that it is not necessary for it to be sent to the Privileges Committee. The person has said that he has said it. He has published it and he keeps on publishing it. What is there for the Privileges Committee to enquire? I am a Member of the Committee of Privileges...

SHRI RAJNARAIN : You must hear the man about whom you are discussing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I understand that He has not denied it. He said it in his own paper. Therefore, I say, kindly give the permission. I beseech you, first of all give the permission to the different people. Many motions can come. Shri Rajnarain also can move something and I can also move that he should be warned and somebody else can say he should be exonerated.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. SRINIVASA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : For a very long time I have been trying my best to draw your attention. I am happy that at least now I have been able to draw your attention.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE : I shall also mention about West Bengal.

SHRI M. SRINIVASA REDDY : Sir, in the country today there is an impression that the Rajya Sabha does mean to discuss almost every day about the affairs of some business people, one or the other. I tell you, Sir, that we in this august House are, for no payment, giving publicity to some business people. It is a disgrace to this House and to us elders to discuss almost every day about some business people or other when there are many other problems in the country where we have to focus our attention to achieve better ends. There are the proper Departments of the Government to look after the business people, to set them right when-

ever and wherever they are wrong, or to launch prosecutions against them, if necessary. On the other hand, this House goes on discussing almost every day about some businessman or the other. Thus we have made ourselves very cheap in the eyes of the people because we go on discussing like that. We cannot afford this luxury of discussing about the business-people and giving them publicity for nothing. It is high time that this House takes note of this unnecessary waste of time and maintains its decorum and dignity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I give my ruling now? Before that, Mr. Bhandari, do you want to say something on this?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Why wait still? You can give your ruling immediately.

SHRI SUNI AR SINGH BHANDARI: I want to say something.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: After him I want to make a submission.

SHRI MAHITOSH PURKAYASTHA (Assam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we have already discussed for one hour this matter, which is not on the agenda of the House.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : श्रीमान्, यह सवाल रूल 187 में उठा है, रूल 187 के अन्तर्गत आपको कमेंट देना है।

श्री सभापति : मैं उसे छ: दफे पढ़ चुका हूँ, आप अगर समझते हैं कि मैं रूल भी नहीं समझता तो मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : जितना मैं समझता हूँ मेरे वही कम में आयेगा और इसी लिये मेरा कहना है कि जो शर्तें आपको कमेंट देने के लिये आवश्यक हैं वे यहाँ पर केवल दो तीन हैं। एक तो स्टन नोटिस आना चाहिये। वह आ गया है।

श्री सभापति : मैं ने सब पढ़ लिया है, आप क्यों कह रहे हैं।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : मेरा यह कहना है कि अगर पढ़ लिया है तो इस विषय को

L 41RS/70

इस सदन में रखने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। अगर आपने इस विषय को सदन में रखा है तो किस मामले में आपको सुनना है वह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि नोटिस स्टन में आ गया। फिर दूसरी शर्त यह है : The question shall be restricted to a specific matter of recent occurrence.

वह भी है। तीसरी शर्त यह है : The matter requires the intervention of the Council. तीसरा तो अब सवाल यही हो सकता था कि यह प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेजा जाना चाहिये या नहीं। अब सवाल यह है कि एक आदमी जो सदन के बाहर है, जिसने अपने पब्लिक स्टेटमेंट में एक बात कही है, उसको हम यहाँ एग्जामिन नहीं कर सकते, उसको सदन में बुला नहीं सकते, तो इसलिये यह और भी जरूरी है कि उसको प्रिविलेज कमेटी बुलाये और यह मुने कि उसे क्या कहना है। तो मेरा कहना है कि दो शर्तें पूरी हो गईं। इसलिये आप रूल 190 के अन्तर्गत यह प्रस्ताव रखने के लिये मेम्बर को कहिये और अगर रिक्विजिट नम्बर आफ मेम्बर्स प्रेजेंट इन दि हाउस उसके लिये खड़े हो जाते हैं तो सीधे-सीधे इसको प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेजिये।

श्री सभापति : आप मुझे मौका तो दें कुछ कहने का तब तो मैं कुछ कहूँ, आप मुझको मौका नहीं देते।

Now please listen to me.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : On a point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have finished it, I have closed the proceedings on it. I am satisfied that there is a *prima facie* case for investigation into the question of privilege against Mr. Ramnath Goenka. I am also satisfied that there is no case against the Minister.

MANY HON. MEMBERS: No, no, no.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: You please sit down, Mr. Chairman. Don't say so. You cannot say so.

(Interruptions)

चेयरमैन साहब, आपने अपने अधिकार का दुरुपयोग किया है। आपका यह कहना है कि "नाट द मिनिस्टर" यह आपके जुडीशल ब्रेन को बताता है। यू हैव्ड मोलज युआर इंडिविजुअलिटी। अच्छा आप हटिए, हमको प्रेसाइड करने दीजिए।

(Interruption)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Go on.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : The Chairman has got every right to say it...

श्री राजनारायण : उसके बाद मैं बताऊंगा रूलिंग कैसे दी जाती है। मैं बताऊंगा कि चेयर को यह हक कहने का नहीं था। It is a disgrace to the Chair, it is a disgrace to democracy. (Interruptions). You are condemning the whole process...

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : You do not deserve to be Chairman ...

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : श्रीमन्, यह आपको कैसे विश्वास हो गया कि मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज का क्वेश्चन नहीं बनता।

(Interruptions)

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : I would request you to allow me to say something. I want your permission.

श्री राजनारायण : आपको सुनने के बाद अब आपमें हमारा विश्वास नहीं है।

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Sir, I would like to say something. (Interruption).

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR (Madhya Pradesh) : It has to be discussed now.

श्री राजनारायण : चेयर की मर्यादा को, प्रतिष्ठा को रखना स्होगा।

(Interruptions)

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Sir, I wanted your permission to say something for the last 1½ hours. Others have been

speaking. I am sorry to say you are unable to control this House. Nevertheless I have been asking permission from you to speak because I hope that at least at this stage you would bring some order in this House. Anyway I am having my say irrespective of what others might do. You were pleased to say that you have found that there was no privilege against the Minister. (Interruption) Let me have my say. You were also pleased to say that you have found a *prima facie* case of privilege against Mr. Ramnath Goenka. There were certain motions before you. The motions must have been for a privilege motion to be moved against a certain person. I do not know whether it was against the Minister or whether it was against Mr. Ramnath Goenka. But you should have in your wisdom and according to the rules of procedure admitted one of these motions. It was not for you to say. Sir, whether there was a *prima facie* case against the Minister or not. Once you admitted this motion and once it goes to the Committee of Privileges, they would come to their own conclusion. The Committee of Privileges would have come to their own conclusions whether there was a *prima facie* case against Mr. Ramnath Goenka and whether incidentally there was a *prima facie* case against Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, the Minister, also, or not. It was for the Committee of Privileges to decide. It was none of our business to prejudge what the Privileges Committee would do. Therefore, I would only request you to send the motion to the Privileges Committee and be done with it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I should like to know one thing. Was there any motion against Mr. Raghunatha Reddy? Was there any valid motion against Mr. Raghunatha Reddy by any Member? That I would like to know.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Will you hear me now or not? Now there does not appear to be—Secretary has read them again—any motion against Mr. Raghunatha Reddy

(Interruptions)

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : That is why I said that you admit one of these motions. It may be against Mr. Ramnath Goenka, and incidentally it may come out ...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Will you listen to me ?

SHRI BHUPES I GUPTA : Your observation that Mr. R ghunatha Reddy has not committed any breach of privilege is absolutely redundant. (Interruption)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No question of redundant.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I congratulate him for the courage and foresight he has displayed. If anybody has got the courage to move the motion against Mr. Reddy, let him move it.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : The position is very simple. There can be or there cannot be a breach of privilege against the Minister. This is a matter of fact. I am not expressing an opinion. It is a matter of fact whether you have received any motion for breach of privilege against the Minister or no. In case you have not received it, then where was the necessity of saying... (Interruption) In case there is no such motion, then your coming to the conclusion that there is no *prima facie* case against him has no meaning. मैं

अपनी बात निवटा दूँ, उसके बाद जैसी आपकी रुझिंग होगी...

MR. CHAIRMAN : Unless I am allowed to complete my sentence, I cannot clear up the position. You do not allow me to complete the sentence.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Whether you like it or not, we must express it, in case there is a motion for reference to the Privileges Committee even against the Minister. Then since the transcription is one, the sides are two, they are like two cross cases, and they have to be tried simultaneously by the same court. So, in case you send one to the Privileges Committee, then the decision about the other also has to be left to the Privileges Committee.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is there.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : I do not object to your deciding it here. But in that case

you have to decide both of them here. But one to be decided here and another to be sent to the Privileges Committee, it is not acceptable.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You do not allow me to say my ruling.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : That is so far as the law is concerned, because you are very well aware that the cross cases are tried by the same court. Now, Sir, suppose we take another view. When you are already sending one case to the Privileges Committee, then prejudging the verdict of the Privileges Committee, why express an opinion here that there is no case against the Minister ? It does not stand to propriety. Therefore, before giving your final ruling, you may keep these things in mind.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I would like to bring to your notice a valid point.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : On a point of order.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Let this House take it into consideration. I am also raising a point of order

श्री राजनारायण : आपके कहे बिना मैं समझता था कि आप उन्हीं को सुनेंगे। सुन लीजिए, वह नोबत आ जायेगी जब लोगों को आप पर अविश्वास करना पड़ेगा।

श्री सभापति : जो चाहे करिए।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं इनके पहले से खड़ा हूँ, आप पहले इनको सुनेंगे, इनमें कौन सी ऐसी विशेषता है, केवल एक खूबी है...

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Let Mr. Rajnarain speak. I am prepared to speak later.

श्री राजनारायण : कोई पार्लियामेंटरी डीमन्डी होनी चाहिए चेयर के लिए।

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am not allowed to complete my sentence here. What is it ?

श्री राजनारायण : अगर आपका दिमाग शान्त है तो मैं आपसे विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन

[श्री राजनारायण]

कर रहा हूँ, आप ला के पंडित हैं, कि श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी ने सदन में एक बयान दिया किसी अब स के बारे में, उस अब स ने रघुनाथ रेड्डी के बयान के लिए कहा कि वह रागद्वेषपूर्ण है और सदन को गुमराह करने की चेष्टा है। अब यह किस जूरिस्पूडेंस के अन्दर इस बात का समावेश हो सकता है कि आप यह कहें कि जिसने सदन में हुए बयान के बारे में प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त की वह तो विशेषाधिकार की अवहेलना करता है और जो खुद बयान है वह हवा में उड़ गया या जमीन में धंस गया। वह बयान आएगा। आप शायद प्रिविलेज कमेटी में नहीं बैठे हैं, मुझे यह सौभाग्य प्राप्त हुआ है। जिनका नाम भी नहीं होता उनकी गवाहियाँ आती हैं, जज की तरह बैठ कर लोग रिकार्ड करते हैं और इस कमेटी के सामने जिसके बारे में मंत्री सम्बन्धित ने सदन में बयान दिया उसने यह सिद्ध कर दिया कि हमारा कथन सत्य था, मंत्री ने जो कहा निराधार था, सदन को गुमराह करने की कांस्पिरेसी थी तो क्या उस मंत्री के ऊपर कुछ आएगा या नहीं ?

श्री महावीर त्यागी : मैंने नोटिस दे दिया है।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं कहना चाहता हूँ आपसे, चेयरमैन साहब से, कि आपने आज तमाम जनतंत्रीय, संसदीय प्रथाओं को दफना दिया यह कह कर इनके ऊपर आएगा, इनके ऊपर नहीं आएगा, प्रत्यक्षतः ऐसा लगता है कि आपकी व्यवस्था एकांगी है, एकपक्षीय है। मैं आप से करबद्ध प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि यह आदरणीय पद है। इस आदरणीय पद की महिमा, गरिमा और सम्मान की रक्षा कीजिए। हम लोग उसके लिए तैयार हैं।

श्री सभापति : जो आप कर रहे हैं वह बहुत काफी है।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : आप जब नहीं करते तो हम को करना पड़ता है।

श्री राजनारायण : ऐसा कोई समाचार पत्र नहीं है जिस ने यह न निकाला हो कि चेयरमैन साहब ने एक घंटा लिया नतीजा घोषित करने में। यह आप के लिए शोभा नहीं देता। यह हमारे लिए शोभा नहीं देता। जिस राज्य सभा का चेयरमैन एक मिनट की जगह एक घंटा ले उस के बारे में लोगों की क्या भावना होगी। इस लिए मैं बहुत दुखी हूँ और मैं आप से हाथ जोड़ कर प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि चेयरमैन साहब, इस सदन की गरिमा गिरायी जा रही है, इस की महिमा नष्ट की जा रही है। केवल विनीत, शिष्ट और साधु कथन मात्र से साधु व्यवहार नहीं होता। चाहे वाणी कितनी ही शिष्ट हो किन्तु यदि व्यवहार दुष्ट होता है तो काफी उस की लीपापोती नहीं कर सकती। इस लिए फिर हाथ जोड़ कर कहता हूँ कि हे चेयरमैन साहब बहादुर, आप अपनी दी हुई व्यवस्था पर पुनः विचार करें और फिर एक साधु व्यवस्था दें। आप को अपनी रूलिंग संशोधित करने का पूरा अधिकार है। मैं बार-बार अनुनय, विनय, सादर, साग्रह निवेदन करता हूँ कि आप ने जो व्यवस्था दी उस व्यवस्था को आप वापस लें और भूपेश गुप्त जी ने जो सलाह दी उस पर भी ध्यान दें...

श्री महावीर त्यागी : मैंने एक नोटिस भी दिया है श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी के बारे में।

श्री राजनारायण : जब त्यागी जी ने नोटिस दिया है तो उस को लीजिए, लेकिन अगर त्यागी जी का नोटिस न भी हो, अगर रघुनाथ रेड्डी के विरुद्ध विशेषाधिकार की कोई बात न भी हो तो भी उन का मामला डिस्कस होगा, उन के बारे में छानबीन होगी। अगर वह सम्मानित व्यक्ति जिस के बारे में रेड्डी जी ने कहा वह प्रमाणों के साथ अपनी बात सिद्ध करता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि राज्य सभा की विशेषाधिकार समिति की बाहु, उस की भुजा काफी लम्बी है, उस का अनुशासन मजबूत है, वह रघुनाथ रेड्डी की गर्दन

* को पकड़ेगी और पकड़ कर कहेगी कि रघुनाथ रेड्डी, तुम गफी मांगो, तुम ने गलत-बयानी की है। आप विशेषाधिकार समिति के अधिकार क्षेत्र को बंद नहीं कर सकते हैं। अगर उस अधिकार क्षेत्र को आप अपनी व्यवस्था से बांधेंगे तो चन्द्रशेखर जी, वह दिन अधिकारपूर्ण होगा।

SHRI TRILOK SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have called Mr. Mohan Dharia.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, may I bring to the notice of this House that there are rules and regulations and I feel that there were two motions—I do not know whether in order or not—sent to the Chairman that they should be allowed to be discussed here. It was under Rule 187.

Now under Rule 190 it is the discretion of the Chair to grant that permission to be discussed here under Rule 187 or not to grant that permission. There were two motions. The whole House has heard the discussion. In regard to the motion moved by Mr. Chandrasekharan, those including myself, have made out a case that it is *prima facie* a breach of privilege.

So far as the other motion is concerned, it was brought to the notice of this House that those who intend to move that motion must say that the allegation made by Mr. Raghunatha Reddy is malicious. They say that whatever is said by Mr. Goenka is very right, and he should have freedom. Beyond that not a single Member has so far said that whatever was said by Mr. Raghunatha Reddy is malicious. Nobody is prepared to take the responsibility of saying that it is malicious. Under these circumstances, it is for you, Sir, to consider—and you have rightly said that in one case there is *prima facie* case . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Does it anywhere say in the procedure...

(Interruption by Shri Rajnarain)

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is a question of breach of privilege. It is for the hon'ble Member, who wants

to say in this House that a particular statement of the hon'ble Minister is malicious, to say that it is a breach of privilege. It is for the hon. Members to bring to the notice of the Chairman and also of this House that a certain portion of the statement of the hon. Minister has committed breach of privilege. We have brought to the notice of the House that the words "maliciously misleading" commit breach of privilege. But those who are having a grievance against Mr. Raghunatha Reddy have not so far stated which paragraph of the hon. Minister's statement or which sentences in his statement commit breach of privilege. Under these circumstances, if you say that there is no case made out and, therefore, you do not give permission, there is nothing wrong in it and it is absolutely in order according to the rules. It is for them to make out a case. Secondly, I would like to say, please do not allow our motion to die. Now that you have said that there is a *prima facie* case, leave should be granted and further consideration will have to follow. Otherwise, the matter will die. We want to pursue the matter. After you have said that there is a *prima facie* case, there is no need to send it to the Privileges Committee. We want to pursue it here and we do not want to allow it to die under all this discussion and confusion.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I want only two minutes.

सभापति जी, मैं एक बात स्पष्ट करदूँ कि ब्रीच आफ प्रिविलेज का सवाल कोई पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है इसलिये इसमें कोई जोश का सवाल नहीं है, कोई गुस्से का सवाल नहीं है। जब कभी ब्रीच आफ प्रिविलेज होता है तो उसमें सारे हाउस की अवमानना की बात है, उसकी मर्यादा की बात है और उसमें सारे मेम्बरो का प्रश्न है। इसलिये पार्टी के आधार पर जोश दिखाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

मान्यवर, आप जानते हैं कि इतिफाक से 15 साल तक उत्तर प्रदेश में प्रिविलेजेज कमेटी में मैं मेम्बर था और जुडीशियरी के विरुद्ध जो विशेषाधिकार उठा उसमें भी रहा, एक सदस्य की हैसियत से जुडीशियरी के खिलाफ

सुप्रीम कोर्ट तक में जो प्रिविलेज का केस आया हमने उसको फाइट किया ।

सभापति जी, मैं स्वयं भी इस व्यु का था और इस व्यु का हूं कि मिस्टर गोयनका पर प्राइमाफेसी ब्रीच आफ प्रिविलेज का केस बनता है । मेरी समझ में आती है कि यह फिट केस है टू गो टू दि प्रिविलेज कमेटी । आप अगर यह कह देते कि प्राइमाफेसी केस गोयनका के खिलाफ बनता है . . .

श्री सभापति : यह कहा ।

श्री नवल किशोर : आप इतनी ही बात कह देते कि तब यह बात सही होती, फिर वह मामला वहां जाता उसके लिये नोटिस होती और तब उनको अवसर होता . . .

श्री नेकी राम (हरियाणा) : आप क्या समझते हैं । आप बैठिये । चेयर ने यही कहा ।

श्री नवल किशोर : आप सुनिये । आई मस्ट हेव माई से ।

श्री नेकी राम : आप हाउस का वक्त बेकार में खराब कर रहे हैं, आप हाउस को गलत रास्ते पर ले जा रहे हैं ।

श्री नवल किशोर : मान्यवर, मैं यह कह रहा था कि जब यह केस वहां जाता और जब उस केस में तय होता कि मिस्टर गोयनका गिल्टी है तो मिनिस्टर साहब की बात स्वयं ही वहां होती, और वे निर्दोश साबित हो जाते मगर जब आपने कह दिया कि मिनिस्टर पर यह आरोप साबित नहीं है तो फिर इतना कहने के बाद उनके खिलाफ कोई केस ही नहीं बन सकता है ।

श्री सभापति : मैंने खत्म नहीं किया जो कुछ मुझे कहना था और आप क्रिटिसाइज करते जा रहे हैं ।

You have not heard me fully.

श्री नवल किशोर : मैं आपको क्रिटिसाइज नहीं कर रहा हूँ । मैं अपनी बात कह रहा हूँ ।

श्री नेकी राम : श्रीमन् आपको क्रिटिसाइज किया जा रहा है ।

श्री नवल किशोर : आप बैठिये, मैं कह रहा हूँ । इसके माने यह है कि प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेजना बेकार हो गया क्योंकि आपने फैसला दे दिया, इनको छोड़ दिया । इससे मानी यही होते हैं . . .

श्री सभापति : मैंने पूरा नहीं किया था । बिना किसी कमेंट के यह फैसला दिया था ।

श्री नवल किशोर : आपके जरिये से ये एनाउंस होना कि एक आदमी पर प्राइमाफेसी केस है और एक पर नहीं है मुनासिब नहीं है ।

श्री सभापति : मेरी बात कोई नहीं सुनेगा, मैं आपसे दरखास्त करूंगा । . . .

श्री राजनारायण : चेयर यह कहते हैं कि हमडे आखीरी बात नहीं कही तो आखीरी बात को सुन लें ।

श्री नवल किशोर : मान्यवर, मेरा कहना है कि अगर जल्दी में और आग्रेश में कोई शब्द मुंह से निकल गया है तो इसमें कोई मर्यादा का प्रश्न नहीं है आप अपने शब्दों को दुहरा कर लीजिये और अपनी रूलिंग को वापस ले लीजिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप अंतिम बात कह लीजिये ।

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa):
Sir, I want to take just one minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please, Mr. Das, you are a Vice-Chairman. Please sit down. Now I want to complete what I wanted to say. You have started judging me without my completing what I wanted to say.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Chairman, please also listen to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not want to hear anybody now . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : No, that is not fair of you. You should be fair to us also.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Without your permission those who can shout and have their say, they can have their say. I am only asking for your permission. You have the discretion. Mr. Chairman, there are two sets of privilege motions before you. One set is of Mr. Chandra Shekhar and others which specifically mentions in the privilege motion that Mr. Ramrath Goenka and the Indian Express have committed a breach of privilege. There is a specific question. There is another set of privilege motions by the or two other Members. As far as I know, even when you asked him, Mr. Tyagi was never clear in his statement that his privilege motion has been directed against the Minister. His motion should have specifically mentioned that Mr. Raghunatha Reddy has, by making such statement, committed a breach of privilege. If that had been done, then I could have taken it that Mr. Tyagi's motion was in order. If that was not done, it is clearly out of order and it ought not to have been taken up at all. That is why I am saying that you have put the entire House into difficulty by adding that second sentence in your decision because that question was not there at all. If Mr. Tyagi had put that question in his privilege motion that Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, by making such statement, committed a breach of privilege of the House, then you could have been in order to pass an opinion on it. But when the motion itself was out of order since it did not make any mention of it, your second sentence was not necessary. In your exuberance you said something—I do not know what the purpose of it was—as a result of which everybody else has been put into difficulty. So, Mr. Chairman, unless there is a specific privilege motion, there is nothing before the House and you have no right even to pass a judgment on that motion. I would, therefore, request you to solve the matter in a very straightforward manner. (Interruptions) A motive has been imputed. Not only that. Two things are involved: the freedom of speech of an individual guaranteed under the Constitution and the right of the

Members of this House. If Mr. Goenka and the Indian Express...

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : May I make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman? You please withdraw the second sentence.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Do not try to confuse the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The second sentence relating to Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, you please delete it...

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, Mr. Das has not yet finished. Please let him finish.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : That is why I am saying that whatever might have happened, you kindly announce here that it is a motion to find out whether there is a breach of privilege and contempt of the House and it may be referred to the Privileges Committee. I want to remind you that according to the functioning of the Privileges Committee, while going into this matter, the Privileges Committee finds that the Minister can be ... (Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS : Sir, I request you now to solve the matter according to the rules. Please say that you find that this privilege motion is not only in order, but *prima facie* is correct and should be referred to the Privileges Committee and that everything else should be decided by the Privileges Committee.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I beg of the House to remember what a privilege is because a statement of facts ... (Interruptions) Please have patience and listen to me. A statement of facts, however incorrect it might be, is not a question of privilege. What is a question of privilege? Supposing Rajnarainji says something tomorrow and somebody outside says that Rajnarainji was bribed and therefore, he said something. Then the right and privilege of Rajnarainji to say what he thinks is correct on the floor of the House is curtailed. Therefore, what is called breach of privilege in this case is neither the statement made by Shri Raghunath Reddy, or the statement of fact made by Shri Goenka. We are not on these statements of facts.

[Shri K. K. Shah]

Shri Goenka has a right to say that the statement made by Shri Raghunatha Reddy is not correct. We are not on these facts. We are on the question whether the right of a Member to say something here which he thinks is correct is being curtailed by allegations made outside the House. From that point of view, your ruling is hundred per cent correct...

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. B. RAJU : If you follow the rules, there will be no trouble...

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have read these rules.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं एक डैफिनिट प्वाइन्ट आफ ऑर्डर रोज करना चाहता हूँ। मेरा कहना यह है कि जब चेयर ने यह कह दिया है कि मैंने अधूरा सेन्टेंस कहा था तो क्या उस बात पर इस सदन में बहस होगी। यहां पर इस तरह की बकवास क्यों की जा रही है।

श्री सभापति : अब आप बैठ जाइये।

SHRI V. B. RAJU : You had only one motion before you. Under rule 190, you have to allow the Member to make a statement...

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have read these rules fifty times.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Once he makes that statement...

MR. CHAIRMAN : He has not made that statement.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : You have given a ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have not understood me.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Please hear me. In the first part of your statement you found *prima facie* that there is actually breach of privilege in Shri Goenka's statement. Then comes rule 190. Under this rule, the Member who has sent the notice should speak. Let him be asked to speak. After that, the House will be seized of the matter.

You have no right to send it to the Privileges Committee... (Interruptions). Now you must allow the Member to make a statement. After that, it is for the House to decide whether it should be allowed to go to the Privileges Committee or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am very sorry that the hon. Members did not allow me even to complete my sentences and my decision. I am very sorry...

AN HON. MEMBER : We are also sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You are also sorry? Now please listen. The case of Mr. Chandra Shekhar was that we are not concerned with the question about the correctness or otherwise of the facts, we are concerned with the question that the word 'malicious' had been used in respect of the Minister. That was his case. Now, there was no allegation against Mr. Raghunatha Reddy. All that was being said was, his name was mentioned in the debate—if I may call this a debate—his name was mentioned, but it was never said in any of the speeches or letters that he deliberately and maliciously had said something. Now, when I said ...

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Why did you say ? ...

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Again you will not allow me to complete my sentence. Please ... (Interruptions). Now, when I said that there was a *prima facie* case for investigation against Mr. Goenka, I had to follow it up, which I was prevented from doing, by saying that I give my consent to the raising of the question of privilege against Mr. Goenka. When I said there was no case against Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, I meant to say that there was no allegation against him. At this stage...

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Why 'No' ? ...

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, it is known that the motions, privilege motions, must

be given to me before the House sits. Notices of privilege motions should be given to me before the House sits. Now, I got the impression that there was no case alleged in the notice against Shri Raghunatha Reddy, the law being that a statement even though it might be incorrect, cannot be the basis of a charge of privilege against a Minister unless it is further proved or further alleged that the statement is deliberately false or malicious. Now, this is the law and there have been several rulings of my predecessors on this question.

Now, when his name was mentioned in the speeches, it was mentioned as an alternative. Even in the speeches I did not hear the word that he said something deliberately false or he acted maliciously. Now, without my prior consent, no motion can be made in this House on the question of privilege. I was merely giving my consent to the privilege motion in accordance with the subsequent rules, Rule 190 and others, when a Member will stand up and twenty-five others will stand up and so on, and that procedure I have still to adopt. It is no good telling me repeatedly that this is the procedure which I should adopt. I have, therefore, ruled that I give my consent to the motion being made or the question of privilege being raised, to use the language of the Rule, against Mr. Goenka. That was what I intended. That is what I have done.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Sir . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Now, no talk . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : May I make a submission, Sir ?

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : One thing more I have to say about this. I have not finished yet . . .

(Interruptions)

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : आप इसके बारे में कहना चाहते हैं ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, no.

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : इसमें मुझे कहना पड़ेगा . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : महावीर त्यागी जी ने मुझे यह नोटिस दिया—

“Hereby I beg to give notice of a motion of privilege against Shri Raghunatha Reddy on account of false statement he made on the floor of the House with regard to the question of inquiry against Mr. Ram Nath Goenka . . .”

Now, this notice I should have got earlier according to the rule and, secondly, even in this notice it has not been said that the statement was deliberately false . . . because under the law, an incorrect statement cannot be the basis of a charge of breach of privilege. Unless the statement is deliberately false—and in this case I have to satisfy myself by calling the Minister and asking him what are the facts—then alone I can give consent against the Minister. These are the rulings here.

1 P.M.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What about my motion ? You cannot read one only . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : When I said that there was a *prima facie* case, I do not express any opinion. It is for the House to deal with the matter in accordance with the rules—No. 190 and the following rules. That is, I never expressed an opinion. All that I said was that it was a *prima facie* case for investigation. The House may not accept it. It may find that the charge against Mr. Goenka has not been established. I am giving his case to the House to decide. That is the position. I have not expressed any opinion at all. I want to proceed with the further stage.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : After getting the leave of the House, then the discussion can start.

MR. CHAIRMAN : My ruling is, I have given permission to Mr. Chandra Shekhar and others to raise the question of privilege in this House.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Whose motion was received first ?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : On a point of order. Now that you have given Mr. Chandra Shekhar the permission to seek the leave of the House, the whole debate will start only when he has sought the permission of the House. Why should the Leader of the Opposition be permitted to speak ?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : You have to be reminded, Sir, that the first motion should get priority ?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : I belong to the Opposition.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please listen. In the first motion, all that is said is this :

"I beg to seek your permission to raise a question of privilege in connection with the press statement issued by Shri Ramnath Goenka describing the statement of the Minister of Company Law, Shri Raghunatha Reddy, made in the House as a maliciously misleading statement."

It is said that a breach of privilege has been committed by Mr. Goenka. That is not said here.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I will have to have my say. Please hear me.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now let me please listen to Mr Tyagi. If you want to move your motion, I have no objection; I will allow you to move the motion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What about my motion ?

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : I withdraw what I said about Mr. Chandra Shekhar's. I give Mr. Tyagi the right to move his motion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What about my motion ? On a point of order, Sir. There cannot be discrimination. All motions came when this House was sitting, one from Mr. Tyagi, another from me.... (Interruptions) What is the position about mine ? I should like to know. Mine should be allowed also.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : What happened to my motion ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, your motion relates to a later stage..

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All right.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal) : I want to make my points with regard to the question that has been raised here. The point raised by Mr. Chandra Shekhar specifically was against a statement issued by Mr. Goenka making ...

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is over.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY : Please allow me to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That stage is over.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Please sit down.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY : I am within my right to speak here. Mr. Misra, please allow me to finish. The question is very specific whether there has been a breach of privilege committed by Mr. Goenka. The point that has been taken up by Members of the Opposition about that statement of the Minister cannot be accepted, cannot be taken together with this. That is my contention. (Interruptions) Please allow me to finish. There is one specific suggestion. Please have the patience to hear my point.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI JAGANNATH RAO) : I want to make a submission.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : He cannot be allowed to confuse the issue now. You have called upon Mr. Tyagi.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO : I only submit that the notice should have been given before the commencement of the sitting.

श्री महावीर त्यागी : श्रीमन्, मैं बहुत ही अदब के साथ हाउस के सामने यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि जो बयान श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी

साहब ने उस रोज दिया था उसको हमने सुना और उससे हमको बड़ा धक्का लगा उनकी बातें सुन कर क्योंकि उसमें बहुत काफी गम्भीर चार्जेंज थे, लेकिन उसको हम सही और झूठ तो नहीं कह सकते...

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : आपको क्या धक्का लगा, आपको धक्का नहीं लगना चाहिये ।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : बहुत सीरियस चार्जेंज थे और वह बातें जो कि नहीं पूछी गई वह भी जवाब में आ गई थी । हम उसको गलत नहीं कह सकते थे क्योंकि हमारे पास उनके गलत या सही होने का सबूत नहीं है ।...

MR. CHAIRMAN : I want to point this out to you, Mr. Tyagi. I have given my consent to you in respect of your first notice. I have not given my consent to you in respect of the notice you gave me just now. You must remember this.

श्री महावीर त्यागी : मैं उसी को बोल रहा हूँ । जो बयान सरकार की तरफ से आया है, जिस वक्त आया उस वक्त ही हमारा दिल ज़रा धड़काया कि जो कुछ पहले था उसमें कई गुना यह बात है ।...

श्री अवधेश्वर प्रताप सिंह (बिहार) : पहले अपने पोटिम को पढ़िये ।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : तो उसको देखकर, क्योंकि हमारे पास कोई कागज नहीं था, हमारे पास कोई इत्तिला नहीं थी, उसकी वाबत मैं कुछ नहीं कर सकता था लेकिन अगले दिन रामनाथ गोयनका का बयान अखबार में पढ़ा और उन्होंने अपने बयान में यह लिखा जो मुझ पर चार्जेंज लगाये गये हैं वे मलिशस हैं, फाल्स हैं और खास कर यह कि 7 करोड़ 89 लाख रु० अपनी नेशनल कंपनी में निकाल कर इंडियन आइल के शेयर खरीद लिये, उन्होंने कहा विलकुल जैनीशम है । यह मेरे इंडियन एक्सप्रेस को, चूँकि मैं सपोर्ट नहीं करता हूँ गवर्नमेन्ट को इसलिए मुझको गिराने के वास्ते किया गया । अब भी श्री रघुनाथ रेड्डी के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज का सवाल नहीं । यह

माफ़िन होना चाहिये उन्होंने जानबूझ कर किया, और अगर यह चीज मालूम होनी तो रघुनाथ रेड्डी के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज का सवाल उठता । लेकिन जब रामनाथ गोयनका ने इस तरह के बयान दिये जिसमें मिनिस्टर के ऊपर ऐसा सख्त लांछन लगे तो मुझे तकाजा हुआ कि इसकी मफायी होनी चाहिये । मेरे पास सिवाय इसके कोई चारा नहीं था कि अपने बहुत पुराने दोस्त श्री रामनाथ गोयनका के ऊपर यह मोशन लाऊँ क्योंकि उसी के ऊपर चल सकता था प्रिविलेज मोशन, उसी पर दिया, लेकिन मुझे यह उम्मीद हमेशा थी कि जब प्रिविलेज मोशन की दरकार होगी, और रामनाथ गोयनका सही होंगे, तो मिनिस्टर के झूठे बयान के ऊपर मिनिस्टर का केस लिया जायेगा, मिनिस्टर का बदला लिया जायेगा और सजा दी जायेगी ।...

श्री पीताम्बर दास : बदला कोई नहीं लेता ।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : मेरी मन्शा नहीं है कि अकेले रामनाथ गोयनका को नुकसान पहुंचाने के लिये मैं कर रहा हूँ । मैं तो यह जानने के लिये कर रहा हूँ ताकि कमिटी के पास जाये और कमिटी की काट करने के बाद सरकार कुछ बता दे कि रामनाथ के लांछन गलत हैं या जिस तरह का जवाब मिनिस्टर ने दिया है वह मोटिवेटेड है । उसके बाद हाउस इस सवाल पर फैसला करेगा । इस लिये मैं मूव करता हूँ ।...

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have to ask for the leave of the House.

श्री महावीर त्यागी : लेकिन जिम रामनाथ गोयनका के बयान का मैंने जिक्र किया है ।...

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY : On a point of order. His motion cannot be moved now, when we are discussing the question of Mr. Ramnath Goenka . . .

श्री महावीर त्यागी : क्योंकि रामनाथ गोयनका ।...

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Allow them to say anything and allow us to say everything.

श्री महावीर त्यागी : मिस्टर रामनाथ गोयनका ने एक स्टेटेमेंट ऐसा दिया है जिस पर मेरी राय में उन पर प्रिविलेज का केस चल सकता है। उस बयान को मैं टेबल पर रखता हूँ और हाउस से इजाजत चाहता हूँ कि वह मुझको इजाजत दें कि मैं रामनाथ गोयनका के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज मोशन को करा सकूँ और यह कमेंटी के सुपुर्द किया जाये ताकि इसकी तहकीकात हो।

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY : I want to know under which rule Mr. Mahavir Tyagi is now moving his motion of privilege. Show me the rule. If the Minister has made a wrong statement, please allow him to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. You are out of order.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY : Sir, a privilege motion may be raised . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, please sit down. Has Mr. Tyagi the leave of the House to raise a question of breach of privilege against Mr. Ramnath Goenka ?

(Seeing the sense of the House)

No objection. The House grants the leave.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : Since you have given permission now, I move as Leader of the House that this House do decide the question of privilege in this House forthwith.

HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Under what rule ?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : It will go to the Privileges Committee.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : Sir, on a point of order. I beg to rise on a point of order. The hon. and learned Leader of the House has moved a motion that this

matter of breach of privilege be decided forthwith. Sir, in this connection I beg to say . . .

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : This motion is a substantive motion ?

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : It is a substantive motion. Let me tell the hon. Members that insofar as Mr. Goenka is concerned, he is not a Member of this House, nor is he present here at the moment, and the proceedings for breach of privilege are quasicriminal proceedings. This House cannot charge anybody in his absence without giving him due notice. So, so far as the matter of breach of privilege against Mr. Ramnath Goenka is concerned, the motion made by the hon. Leader of the House, I beg to submit, is out of order. There shall have to be two motions. So far as the breach of privilege against Mr. Raghunatha Reddy is concerned, he is present here in this House and this House can certainly proceed to consider the question of breach of privilege against Mr. Raghunatha Reddy here and now. (Interruptions) I am sorry, Sir. I was under that impression. Since you had given consent to the hon. Member, Mr. Tyagi, to raise the question of breach of privilege, I thought like that. That is all right. My submission is that the matter of breach of privilege against Mr. Ramnath Goenka and those connected with the printing and publication of the Indian Express be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I beg to differ. The rule is very clear on this point. I will tell you what the House of Commons has done.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Wait a minute. An objection has been raised against my motion. My motion is under rule 191. It says :

"If leave under rule 190 is granted, the Council may consider the question and come to a decision or refer it to the Committee of Privileges on a motion made by the Leader of the Council or, in his absence by any other member."

Now, Sir, under Rule 191, I have two alternatives. Since you have given permission, now my duty is to make a motion.

I am entitled to make either a motion under Rule 11 (Interruptions) Kindly read Rule 191. I will read again Rule 191—

"If leave under rule 190 is granted, the Council may consider the question and come to a decision or refer it to the Committee of Privileges on a motion made by the Leader of the Council"

As the Leader of the Council, I have made the motion under the first part and not under the second part. It is my privilege and I have a right to use that privilege.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं पाइन्ट ऑफ आर्डर पर 5 मिनट से खड़ा हूँ। इस सदन में श्री के० के० शाह को विशेष प्रिविलेज हासिल नहीं है, केवल नेता सदन हैं (Interruptions) मैं आपके द्वारा नेता सदन, श्री के० के० शाह की सद्बुद्धि से अपील करना चाहता हूँ और के० के० शाह की न्यायिक बुद्धि से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि संसद् में संख्या-बल पर कोई अशोभनीय काम करने का प्रयत्न हमारे माननीय सम्मानित श्री के० के० शाह के मुखारविन्द से न हो।

SHRI K. K. SHAH : You want it to go to the Committee?

श्री राजनारायण : यह वचकानापन नहीं है, यह बहुत बड़ा प्रश्न है, सिद्धान्त का प्रश्न है, उसूल का प्रश्न है।

AN HON MEMBER : Yes.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I will agree. Let it go to the Committee, Sir.

श्री राजनारायण : जो सदन में घटना घटेगी उस पर देन एंड देयर होता है।

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Sir, I have to move

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I want to move. Why are you looking at me? I am entitled to move.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : There is a complaint of breach of privilege. I move :

That the complaint of breach of privilege against Shri Ramnath Goenka and the Indian Express be referred to the Committee of Privileges with instructions to report to this House before the end of the next session.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I want to move. I move this motion

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : How can two motions be taken up? One motion is already before the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I can move a motion. How can you say about it?

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : It is for the House to decide. Sir, how can he move a motion?

श्री राजनारायण : सब चीज का मजाक होगा, मोशन का भी मजाक होगा? सदन को एडर्जन करिए, हम लोग शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट को डिस्कस करना चाहते हैं;

MR. CHAIRMAN : I want to know whether

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Sir, you must allow only after knowing what the motion is about. One motion is already before the House. The Leader of the House has referred the question of privilege

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is a motion before the House.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : You can discuss only one.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am on this motion.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, unless you permit him

SHRI RAJNARAIN : There cannot be any amendment

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am entitled, Mr. Shah, and as the Leader of the House

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR : On point of order, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Shah the Leader of the House, has moved motion before the House. I quite conce

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

that. He has the right, and he is doing. But that does not mean that another Member cannot move a substitute motion.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : It is a substantive motion. You look whether it is permissible.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : You cannot receive it even now, Sir, unless it is very urgent. Under the rule, you cannot receive it, unless it is very urgent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My motion is . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I want to know whether he had asked for your permission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am not prepared to learn about rules from anybody Sir, I say that I will be submitting absolutely to your ruling.

If you think this is the only motion the House should consider, you should say that. I would not come in the way. I could not have given a motion before you admitted the original thing, namely, permission to move. Immediately as you did it, I gave notice seeking your permission. Since the permission was given, I did it. Now it is for you to say whether I can move my motion or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I rule that the Leader of the House alone has got the right to move.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : Why do you say "alone" ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : We have discussed long enough. I want to put the motion. The question is :

"That the complaint of breach of privilege against Shri Ramnath Goenka and the Editor, Indian Express, be referred . . .

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : इस में एडीटर, इंडियन एक्सप्रेस कैसे जोड़ा गया है ?

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Editor, Indian Express and Mr. Goenka.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He said that.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : जो मोशन श्री त्यागी जी का मंजूर हुआ है उस में श्री रामनाथ गोयनका के विरुद्ध, जो उन का स्टेटमेंट

है उस के ऊपर ही यह प्रिविलेज का सवाल उठा दिया है ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Your motion may be something else. The Indian Express must be named. A paper can be named only in the name of its publisher, Editor and Printer.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : May I make one submission? Now, one after another we are getting into trouble because the decision is not taken immediately. That is my humble submission. The motion was made by the hon'ble Shri Mahavir Tyagi . . .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : It was a complaint, not a motion. The motion was made by the Leader of the House.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : All right. But the leave has been granted to Shri Tyagi to make a motion.

HON'BLE MEMBERS FROM THE TREASURY BENCHES : No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No. My motion was pending. You do not seem to be giving proper guidance. There are two motions, one relating to Mr. Raghunatha Reddy, and another relating to Mr. Ramnath Goenka. He sought your permission . . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : You can speak after me. This is one thing which I am not able to understand. I make submission that the honourable Mr. Tyagi got the leave of the House to raise a question of privilege, and that leave was granted by the House.

HON'BLE MEMBERS FROM THE TREASURY BENCHES : No, no.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : On that leave there is the motion for reference to the Privileges Committees. Now the real question is whether on that leave, anybody can alter or change the substance of the matter which Shri Mahavir Tyagi wanted to raise before the House. So my submission is that it should remain in the form in which the hon'ble Member, wanted to raise it. That is the substance of the matter.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have a submission to make. My submission is that leave was

granted to Mr. Mahavir Tyagi by the House to move against Mr. Ramnath Goenka. The first thing is, it is not an amendment. When you go against Mr. Ramnath Goenka, it automatically goes against the 'Indian Express.'

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : No, no. (*Interruptions*) Why mention it ?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANI RA SHEKHAR : I know your motion for Mr. Goenka. Please be patient. Mr. Chairman, Sir, there can be no motion against Mr. Ramnath Goenka unless and until you have a motion against the 'Indian Express'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : (*Spoke*).

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : (*Spoke*).

MR. CHAIRMAN : Nothing will be recorded.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, I was submitting that if you have to move against Mr. Ramnath Goenka, you shall have to bring in the 'Indian Express' its Editor, Printer and Publisher. So, the motion moved by the hon. Leader of the House is quite in order. It is the exact way in which the question can be brought.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Sir, only one word. I appreciate the sentiments ... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please listen to me. (*Interruptions*) I am giving a ruling in your favour. Why don't you allow me to say it ?

Dr. BHAI MAHAVIR : Sir, Mr. Advani has been trying for half an hour to raise a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is the point of order ?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Sir, my point of order is this. When I heard the leader of the House move this motion and mention the name of the Editor, 'Indian Express', ...

MR. CHAIRMAN : On that I am in your favour.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Sir, please listen to me. My humble submission is that whatever the Rules may be on this, the established practice of Parliament is that whenever there is any motion of breach of privilege against an editor, he is first given notice of the motion and he is first given an opportunity to explain his position before the House takes any decision, whether they refer it to the Privileges Committee or not. Here I have before me a volume ... (*Interruptions*) I am quoting from Kaul & Shakhder's "Practice and Procedure of Parliament". It says very clearly :—

"If a newspaper reports incorrectly the proceedings of the House or comments casting reflection on the House or its members, the Speaker may, in the first instance, give an opportunity to the editor of the newspaper to present his case before giving his consent to the raising of a question of privilege in the House."

Now that you have given consent to the raising of the privilege motion before the House, before the House takes any decision on this motion, the Editor must be given an opportunity to present his case. If, however you uphold the objection raised by the Leader of the Opposition, namely, that the editor of the 'Indian Express' was not mentioned in Mr. Tyagi's motion, then I have nothing to say. (*Interruptions*) My submission is that the Editor of the newspaper must be given an opportunity.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : As far as Mr. Tyagi's motion was concerned, it did not mention any name. Therefore, when you have insisted that it should go to the Committee I accepted your suggestion. I can say that the procedure of the House is hundred per cent correct. Even in the future if such questions arise, there is the guidance given by this House.

Mr. Tyagi's motion did not mention any name. What, therefore, is referred to by Mr. Bhandari is about the notice. In the notice, what is permitted by the House is to raise a question of privilege about certain statements made by Mr.

[Shri K. K. Shah]

Goenka. Now the question raised is a question of breach of privilege. All those who are concerned with the breach of privilege have been mentioned by me.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Including Mr. Raghunatha Reddy ?

SHRI K. K. SHAH : No. Therefore, I cannot mention only Mr. Goenka.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : The statement of Goenka arose out of the statement of Mr. Raghunatha Reddy. How can you take the second statement without considering the first one ?

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्री के० के० शाह साहब, प्रतिक्रिया पर बहस करना चाहते हैं, क्रिया पर नहीं। रिएक्शन लिया जाये, एक्शन न लिया जाये। रिएक्शन एक्शन पर है। चेयरमन साहब, आप रूलिंग दीजिए।

श्री महावीर त्यागी : रघुनाथ रेड्डी साहब ने झूठा बयान दिया होगा या रामनाथ गोयनका ने पब्लिकली मोटिव एट्रीब्यूट किया होगा तो जो क्रस्रवार होगा उसको सजा दी जायगी। जहां तक अखबार का ताल्लुक है हमने यह प्वाइन्ट नहीं रखा। इस बान की तलाश कीजिए कि कौन कौन से अखबारों ने इसको निकाला है क्योंकि उनका कुछ स्टेटमेंट इसमें है और दूसरे अखबारों में भी चर्चा है। इसलिये खाली इंडियन एक्सप्रेस को रखना यह इन्साफी नहीं होगी। हिन्दुस्तान के जितने अखबार हैं उनकी तलाश की जाय कि किस किस ने छपा है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : 190 की तरफ लीडर आफ दी हाउस ने बतलाया कि उन्होंने आपके मोशन के ऊपर दिया है। इसके बारे में कहा गया है :

"If leave under rule 190 is granted, the Council may consider the question..."

तो वह क्वेश्चन कौन मा है। यह क्वेश्चन जो आपने उठाया वही हो सकता है और उसमें आपको एडिटर और इंडियन एक्सप्रेस के नाम जोड़ने का अधिकार नहीं है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, what we have raised here is a privilege issue arising out of a statement. We do not prolong the judgment as to who should be the co-accused. That is entirely a different matter. You have given permission to a privilege issue to be raised and it has been raised. Now under the rules it will be the privilege of the Leader of the Council to move a motion of an operative nature. He has moved a motion of operative nature in which he, according to his right, has named some people. We may add more names to it or we may delete some of them. It is open to the House to add more names by vote, if they like, because the motion, like any other motion, is subject to amendment. Now, in order to make an operative motion, one does not go into each question. It must be concretised. Suppose I say an editorial of a news paper raises an issue of privilege. You allow a motion to be admitted. Suppose in the original motion for which I asked permission. I did not name the editor. Does it follow that when the operative motion comes, the editor, the printer, and the publisher cannot be mentioned? Either all of them or any one of them can certainly be mentioned. It is for this House to add to it or delete from it. I am not questioning the right of the House. We can certainly say that some names can be added or some names can be taken away. It is entirely the right of the House. Therefore, ... (Interruptions) ... the Leader has precedence over the matter as to what kind of a motion should be moved. It is his privilege in this context. (Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं आपके द्वारा श्री भूपेश गुप्त और दूसरे सम्मानित सदस्यों से निवेदन करूंगा कि मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि नेता सदन ने हमारे सुझाव को मान लिया है कि इस मामले को प्रिविलेज कमेटी में जाने दिया जाय। यहां पर इस मामले में तुरन्त विचार न हो, इस तरह का जो उन्होंने फैसला किया है यह उनकी सद्बुद्धि है क्योंकि सदन के अन्दर कोई मामला तत्काल फैसला योग्य हो तो उस पर विचार तुरन्त किया जा सकता है। अच्छा हुआ कि इस मामले पर सदन के अन्दर विचार नहीं किया गया है और इस तरह से उनमें जो सद्बुद्धि आई वह अच्छी आई।

दूसरी बात में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि उसी बुद्धि से न्या प्रिविलेज कमेटी श्री राम नाथ गोयनका के उस बयान को जो उन्होंने दिया है और जो देश के सब अखबारों ने निकाला है—कुछ ने कुछ निकाला, कुछ ने कुछ निकाला—उगर श्री राम नाथ गोयनका के खिलाफ प्रिविलेज बनता है तो जिन अखबारों ने यह बयान निकाला है, छापा है, क्या उनके ऊपर प्रिविलेज नहीं बनेगा। यह प्रिविलेज कमेटी फैसला कर सकती है कि जिन जिन अखबारों ने श्री राम नाथ गोयनका का बयान छापा है वे अखबार स्वतः प्रिविलेज कमेटी के अन्तर्गत आ जाते हैं। (Interruptions)

श्री चन्द्र शेखर : हमने भी तो यही कहा था।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, नेता सदन और श्री चन्द्र शेखर तो इंडियन एक्सप्रेस का नाम लेते हैं। लेकिन मेरा निवेदन है कि यह बयान तो स्टेट्समैन, टाइम्स आफ इंडिया, हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स और दूसरे अखबारों में छापा है। इसलिए मैं आपके द्वारा नेता सदन से निवेदन करूँगा कि अगर अखबारों के नाम लेने की कोई बाधा आती है तो अगर श्री राम नाथ गोयनका के विरुद्ध विशेषाधिकार का मामला आता है तो उन्होंने कंटेम्प्ट आफ दी हाउस किया तो फिर उन अखबारों के संबंध में भी आ जायेगा जिन्होंने उनका बयान छापा है। इसलिए मैं आपके द्वारा फिर चाहूँगा कि हमारे इस सदन के सचिव नेता सदन को जाकर समझा दें कि जो श्री राजनारायण कह रहे हैं वह सत्य है।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Our discussion should be on the basis of the motion and in the motion the words "Indian Express" are mentioned. Whenever we take action on the basis of written words all the persons responsible for those words should be involved. Therefore, the motion should include the printer, the publisher and the editor.

Secondly, it must be very clear that this motion should be strictly under rule 189 and only the question whether the words

"malicious" and "mala fide" contained in Shri Goenka's statement constitute a breach of privilege or not, should be examined and beyond that nothing else. The Privileges Committee cannot become a court of law to examine the earlier statements issued by others . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : You are making the same points.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I have to make a submission. The leave has been granted by the House. The motion to be moved by the Leader of the House is to be judged only by you whether it is in order or not. Nobody has the right to say that this should be taken out or that should be added. If you think that the motion by the Leader of the House is in order, that will be acceptable to us . . .

ONE HON. MEMBER : No, no.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I do not think that the motion is circumscribed by the earlier complaints. That way, you also hold that *prima facie* in the complaint which I have made . . . (Interruptions). I do not know how to deal with these people.

Mr. Chairman, a third person might have brought the question to the Times of India or the Hindustan Times or The Statesman. If the motion is to be moved by the Leader of the House, he has to take into consideration all aspects of the question or all aspects of the complaint. It is for you and it is within your jurisdiction to see whether the scope of the complaint is being expanded or it is within limit . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Tyagi's motion—I am sorry I have used the wrong word. It is not a motion, but a complaint. Shri Tyagi's complaint was confined to Shri Goenka . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : It is not even a complaint. It is only an information.

MR CHAIRMAN : . . . and I rule that in respect of that complaint alone, the Leader of the House's statement should be accepted. But as other hon. Member have given notices of complaints, it is there right also to press them.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I think the Leader of the House should accept this suggestion.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : On a point of order.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I am pressing for my complaint.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Have you disposed of one question ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : First I want to put Shri Tyagi's motion. The question is :

"That the complaint of breach of privilege against Shri Ramnath Goenka be referred to the Committee of Privileges with instructions to report to this House before the end of the next session."

The motion was adopted

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I also rise to speak.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, on a point of order.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir ... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : He has a point of order. I will listen to him and then I will listen to you.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : This point has been disposed of now and my submission is that if anything has to be taken up, it should be taken up after the lunch hour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No. . . .

(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes. . . .

(Interruptions).

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Chairman, Sir. . . *(Interruptions).*

. . . Sir, have I got your permission ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now, is it the wish of the House that the proceedings will continue ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The proceedings of the House will continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes. . . .
(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No. . . .
(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, डिबीजन ।
श्रीमन्, डिबीजन ।

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH : Division, please . . *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : All right. . . .
(Interruptions)

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH . . . we have a right . . . *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

श्री राजनारायण : डिबीजन, श्रीमन्,
आज संसदीय प्रथा की सीमा भी पार हो जाने
दीजिए ।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Those who want to continue the proceedings, will kindly stand up.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH : It cannot be. . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : It cannot be. Divide the House. . . .
(Interruptions)

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH : Divide the House. . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Let us take up after lunch . . .

(Interruptions)

श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : खुदा के वास्ते लंच
के लिए तो जाने दीजिए ।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My submission is, Sir. . . . *(Interruptions)*

My submission is, Sir

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till quarter to three.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-four minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at quarter to three of the clock. **MR. CHAIRMAN** in the Chair.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I want to make it quite clear that I have nothing against the Editor of the 'Indian Express' personally. My doubts are that if you do not include the names of the Editor, Printer and Publisher of the 'Indian Express' in the motion, it may be perhaps incomplete and Mr. Goenka may say that he did not make any statement at all and this was published in the 'Indian Express'. Some friends on the other side said that other papers have also published this statement. I have not seen this statement in the other papers.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : It was in the 'Statesman' and the 'Hindustan Times'.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : My friend Shri Niren Ghosh says that the Statesman and the Hindustan Times have also published this statement. In view of the scope of the function of the Privileges Committee I hope the Committee will take into consideration all these aspects and if they think fit, they will include the Editor, Printer and Publisher of the Indian Express also. I make this statement only to put on record so that Mr. Goenka, who is the main mischief maker may not get the pretext of not having issued the statement. So I am insistent that the Editor, Printer and Publisher of the 'Indian Express' should also be included.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The Committee may take note of this.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : Mr. Goenka started his newspaper career in Madras. He had fought against the British and he may fight with you also.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

I. THE SOUTHERN STATES (REGULATION OF EXPORT OF RICE) AMENDMENT ORDER, 1970

II. THE MANIPUR FOODGRAINS (MOVEMENT) CONTROL (AMENDMENT) ORDER, 1970

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA) : On behalf of Shri Annasaheb Shinde, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, a copy each of the following Notifications (in English and Hindi) of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Department of Food) :

(i) Notification G.S.R. No. 1228, dated the 25th August 1970, publishing the Southern States (Regulation of Export of Rice) Amendment Order, 1970. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4165/70].

(ii) Notification G.S.R. No. 1263, dated the 28th August, 1970 publishing the Manipur Foodgrains (Movement) Control (Amendment) Order, 1970. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4166/70].

STATEMENT BY MINISTER RE PRIVY PURSES AND PRIVILEGES

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Sir, I lay on the Table a statement regarding Privy Purses and Privileges. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-4167/70]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : It should be read out, otherwise we should be given time.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : We do not know what it is.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA) : We would like it to be read out.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : I would request the Minister to read it.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : We would like it to be read out