

DEMAND FOR FERTILIZERS

90. SHRI RAM CHANDER: Will the Minister of FOOD AND AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) what is the total demand for fertilizers in the country at present and to what extent it can be met from indigenous sources; and

(b) the total quantum of import of fertilizers during the current year; and the names of the countries from which these are being imported?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD, AGRICULTURE, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION (SHRI ANNASAHB SHINDE) : (a) and (b) A statement is attached.

STATEMENT*Estimated Demand Indigenous Production and Imports In 1967-68*

	(In '000 tonnes)		
	Nitrogen	Phosphates	Potash
	(N)	(P ₂ O ₅)	(K ₂ O)
Target of consumption	1350	500	300
Target of Indigenous Production	500	250	Negligible
Imports likely during the year	815	300	293

Names of principal countries from which imports are arranged

- | | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| 1. U.S.S.R. | 8. United Kingdom |
| 2. G.D.R. | 9. West Germany |
| 3. Poland | 10. France |
| 4. Rumania | 11. Australia |
| 5. U.S.A. | 12. Holland |
| 6. Canada | 13. Italy. |
| 7. Japan | |

†Transferred from the 26th May, 1967.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY BETWEEN AHMEDABAD AND BOMBAY

171. SHRI M. C. SHAH: Will the Minister of TRANSPORT AND SHIPPING be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the National Highway between Ahmedabad and Bombay requires urgent repairs especially in that portion which is within the Maharashtra State limit; and

(b) whether Government have considered the necessity to construct a bridge near Vasai to shorten the distance?

THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT AND SHIPPING (PROF. V. K. R. V. RAO): (a) The general condition of the road is fairly good and no urgent or emergent repairs are necessary.

(b) The Member is presumably referring to the bridge over the Bassein

† Transferred from the 26th May, 1967.

Creek on the new alignment of Bom-bay-Ahmedabad road *via* Dahisar, Ghodbunder and Manor. This bridge is already under construction and is now expected to be completed by the end of 1968. With its completion, and the opening of the new road to traffic, the distance between Bombay and Ahmedabad will be shortened by about 12 miles.

SALE OF FAKE D.T.U. TICKETS

188. SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Will the Minister of TRANSPORT AND SHIPPING be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a Ticket Gang operating in Delhi has recently cheated the Delhi Transport Undertaking by the sale of fake tickets?

THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT AND SHIPPING (PROF. V. K. R. V. RAO): A complaint to this effect had been received but on enquiry by

the C.B.I. no material was found Which could substantiate the allegations.

दिल्ली परिवहन की वस्तुओं की चोरी

366. श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी :

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालाल
चोरडिया :

क्या परिवहन तथा नौवहन मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) क्या अप्रैल, 1967 के आखिरी सप्ताह में दिल्ली परिवहन की एक बस की चोरी हो गई थी ;

(ख) चोरी चली गई बस की बरामद करने के लिये क्या कार्यवाही की गई और उसका क्या परिणाम निकला ;

(ग) गत छः महीनों के दौरान दिल्ली परिवहन से विभिन्न सामान की चोरी की कितनी घटनाएँ दर्ज हुई हैं ; और

(घ) उपरोक्त घटनाओं के सिलसिले में कितनी गिरफ्तारियाँ हुई हैं ; और कितनी वस्तुएँ बरामद की गई ?

t [THEFTS OF D.T.U. ART | CLES

366. SHRI SUNDAR SINGH
BHANDARI: SHRI V. M.
CHORDIA:

Will the Minister of TRANSPORT AND SHIPPING be pleased to state:

(a) whether a bus belonging to the Delhi Transport Undertaking was stolen in the last week of April, 1967;

(b) what action was taken to recover the stolen bus and What was the result thereof;

tTransferred from the 2nd June, 1967.

(c) what was the number of incidents of thefts of various articles of the Delhi Transport Undertaking registered during the last six months; and

(d) what was the number of arrests made in connection with the above-mentioned incidents and how many articles were recovered?]

परिवहन तथा नौवहन मंत्री (प्रो०
वी० के० आर० वी० राव) : (क) जी
हां।

(ख) दिल्ली परिवहन संस्थान के पर्य-
वेक्षी कार्यजाल को तथा पुलिस को तुरन्त
रिपोर्ट कर दी गई थी। बस परित्यक्त पाई
गई और उसी दिन सही सलामत मिल गई।

(ग) पिछले छः महीनों में दि० ५० सं०
के सुरक्षा कर्मचारियों द्वारा चोरी के 15
मामले पकड़े गये। इनमें से तीन मामले संगीत
ये और उनकी रिपोर्टें पुलिस को कर दी गईं।
शेष 12 मामलों में विभागीय कार्यवाही की
गई है।

(घ) अभी तक कोई गिरफ्तार नहीं
किया गया है। लगभग 7061 रुपयों की
वस्तुओं में से लगभग 2286 रुपये की
वस्तुएँ मिल गई हैं।

t[THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT
AND SHIPPING (PROF. V.K.R.V. RAO):
(a) Yes.

(b) An immediate report was made to the supervisory net-work of the Delhi Transport Undertaking and a report was also lodged with the Police. The bus was found abandoned and was recovered intact the same day.

(c) 15 cases of theft were detected by the security staff of the D.T.U.

t [] English translation.

during the last six months. Of these, 3 cases being of a serious nature were reported to the Police. In the other 12 cases action has been taken de-partmentally.

(d) No arrests have been made so far. Out of articles worth about Rs. 7061.00 articles worth about Rs. 2286.00 were recovered.]

12 NOON

MOTIONS OF BREACH OF PRIVILEGE AGAINST THE EDITORS OF "HINDUSTAN" AND "HINDUSTAN TIMES"

MR. CHAIRMAN: A notice of a question of privilege has been received from Shri Krishan Kant and Shri Chandra Shekhar which relates to certain observations contained in an editorial in the *Hindustan*, a Hindi daily published from Delhi, of the 2nd June, 1967. I am giving my consent to raise this question. Shri Krishan Kant or Shri Chandra Shekhar may now do so. There is also a notice on the same matter from Shri Rajnarain.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): From me also.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, from Shri Murahari also.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana): I beg to move a motion of privilege against the Editor of *Hindustan*, a Hindi daily of Delhi . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must ask for the leave of the House first.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I beg the leave of the House to move a motion of privilege . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You kindly state your question and then ask for leave.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I beg the leave of the House to move a motion *at* privilege against the Editor of *Hindustan* a Hindi daily, who has committed a breach of privilege of Members of this House.

In its editorial of 2nd June, 1967, it has attacked the Members of this House in a most deplorable and mischievous way. I would like to bring to the notice of the hon. Members some of the sentences included in the editorial which by themselves will prove the *mala fide* intentions of the Editor. It is a deliberate attempt to bring the Members of this august House into disrepute in the public eye. The editorial says—here I am quoting from the editorial:

"In the twelve hours' debate in the Rajya Sabha, the Hazari Report was used in an incongruous and undesirable manner as a medium of shooting baseless allegations against all canons of democratic propriety. The announcements made by Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, the Minister for Industrial Development, in reply to the debate clearly indicate that these allegations are baseless and unworthy of consideration according to the Government. Not only that, the Industries Minister showed his regret at the level of discussion and for giving it an undesirable slant for propaganda purposes."

After giving his own views . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you please read out the particular passage . . .

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: That is what I am reading out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please read the Hindi version.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: I have translated that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly read from the Hindi version.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: Yes. After giving his own views of the debate, the Editor goes on to say:

“हजारी रिपोर्ट को बहस का माध्यम बनाने से पूर्व संसद सदस्यों को स्वयं उक्त रिपोर्ट को सुनाई, प्रामाणिकता एवं निष्पक्षता की कसौटी पर कस कर देखना चाहिये।”

He says "Before making Hazari Report as a basis of discussion, Members of Parliament should have tested it on the basis of facts, proofs and impartiality." After blowing hot and cold over the Hazari Report, he further goes on to say:

"ऐसी अज्ञानिक, अप्रामाणिक एवं दुःसाहसपूर्ण हजारी रिपोर्ट का आधार बनाकर संसद में जो हंगामा खड़ा किया गया है और जिन मिशनरी मसाइटी और धर्मयोद्धा के आवेश एवं आवेग में बिरला साम्राज्य का मूल पैदा किया गया, इस ओर के मूल में जितना कुटिलता, कायरता एवं कुमति है उतना शायद ही आज तक पार्लमेंट के मंच पर प्रदर्शित हुई होगी।"

I do not know whether we created this demon or the demon is speaking through the Editor. Then the Editor goes on to say:

प्रश्न है कि क्या हजारी रिपोर्ट का आधार लेकर संसद के मंच से जो अनर्गलता, विश्वसन, चरित्रहानि एवं अविवेक प्रदर्शित हुआ क्या यह संसद एवं उसके सदस्यों की प्रतिष्ठा के अनुरूप था ?

as if he knows more about the prestige of Parliament Members than Members of Parliament themselves. The Editorial also deplores the participation of some Congress Members in the criticism of the Birla group during the debate in this House of Parliament. The Editorial is given the heading "निराधार, अनर्गल व अनुचित"

,Baseless, Reckless and Improver)" This is how he describes the debate in the Rajya Sabha. I do not know what more is required to prove the contempt of this House by the Editor of Hindustan.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: (Andhra Pradesh): Who is the owner?

SHRI KRISHAN KANT: The Birla Group. Now I may refer to May's Parliamentary Practice, page 109.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You need not refer to all that. There is no necessity to refer to that. You can sit down.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): Before the discussion goes on, may I . . .

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, मैं वह पोर्शन पढ़े दे रहा हूँ . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the House wants to say something.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, वह पोर्शन अभी नहीं आया है, उसे सुनने तो दीजिये। मेरा क्या विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न है, कृपा करके उसको सुनने दीजिए। उसे बड़ी आसानी से मंत्री जी कह सकते हैं वह विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न नहीं है . . .

श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार) : नहीं, नहीं।

श्री राजनारायण : सुनिये पहले। विशेषाधिकार अवहेलना के बारे में मेरा पत्र इस प्रकार है :

"श्री सचिव, राज्य सभा, नई दिल्ली।

प्रिय महोदय,

राज्य सभा में हजारी रिपोर्ट पर हुई बहस के सम्बन्ध में गत 2 जून के सम्पादकीय में हिन्दुस्तान हिन्दी दैनिक पत्र ने लिखा है 'किन्तु खेद का प्रसंग है कि कतिपय संसद सदस्यों ने इस रिपोर्ट को उसके मूल उद्देश्य के विन्दु से नहीं परखा और केवल वैयक्तिक एवं दलीय प्रचार अथवा एक संस्थान विशेष एवं व्यक्ति विशेष को बदनाम करने के माध्यम के रूप में ही इसका इस्तेमाल किया।'

संसद में सदस्य अपने कर्तव्यों का पालन किसी राग द्वेषपूर्ण ढंग से नहीं करते और न तो व्यक्तिगत प्रचार या दल प्रचार के लिये किसी व्यक्ति को बदनाम करके संसद

[श्री राजनारायण]

का इस्तेमाल करते हैं। ऐसा दोषारोपण करना सदन का अवमान है और संसद् के विशेषाधिकार की अवहेलना है और संसद् सदस्यों पर इस प्रकार का साम्पादकीय अप्रलेख भिख कर संसद् के सदस्यों को अपने कर्त्तव्य से च्युत कराने का दुष्प्रयास है। अतः मैं हिन्दुस्तान के सम्पादक, व्यवस्थापक, के विरुद्ध विशेषाधिकार अवहेलना का प्रश्न प्रस्तुत करता हूँ ?"

श्रीमन्, इस संबन्ध में मैं आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं किसी भी सम्पादक या किसी भी व्यक्ति का जो अधिकार है, उसको भी सुरक्षित रखना चाहता हूँ। मैं जानता हूँ और कतई मैं इस मत का हूँ कि कोई भी सम्पादकीय अप्रलेख लिख सकता है कि संसद् में जो यह विचार हुआ बिल पर या किसी और विषय पर, उसके वह सहमत नहीं हैं, जो आरोप लगाये गये वे निराधार हैं, वे गलत हैं, वे सत्य नहीं हैं—इसने कोई विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न नहीं खड़ा हो सकता है। यह किसी भी अखबार को लिखने का हक शामिल है। मगर कोई भी सम्पादकीय अप्रलेख इस तरह से नहीं लिख सकता कि संसद् के सदस्यों ने व्यक्तिगत द्वेषपूर्ण भाव से और किसी को बदनाम करने के लिये कोई कान किया—यह हर्गिज नहीं कह सकते किसी के बारे में। इसलिये यह सीधा, क्लियरला कन्टेम्प्ट आफ दि हाउस है। And every contempt of the House is a question of breach of privilege. इसलिये मैं आपके द्वारा उस अखबार के सम्पादक और उसके मैजिस्ट्रेट के विरुद्ध विशेषाधिकार अवहेलना का प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत करता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has the Member the leave of the House to raise this question?

(No Hon. Member dissented) Leave is granted. SHRI M. C. CHAGLA: I beg to move:

"That the complaints of breach of privilege raised by Shri Krishan Kant, Shri Chandra Shekhar, Shri Rajnarain and Shri G. Murahari, be referred to the Committee of Privileges with instructions to report before the end of the next session."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): I have another notice of breach of privilege. With your permission, I want the permission of this august House to raise a question of breach of privilege against the Editor of "Hindustan Times," and English weekly of Delhi. There is an article in its issue of the 4th June, 1967 on page 9 under "National Affairs."

In this article the paper has offered indignity to this House and also to the Members of this House. Mr. Chairman. generally I do not like and I will not be in favour of raising any matter of privilege against the newspapers if there is a question of reporting of news but if any newspaper writes an editorial or an article it is a well-thought-out affair and the paper should be held responsible for committing a breach of privilege. I quote the re'e-vant portion from this article 'National Affairs'. It is about the discussion on the Hazari report.

"The proposition has only to be put in this manner to recognise the absurdity of it. But this precisely what it amounts to if we are to take with any seriousness the wild charges which have been flung in Parliament against the Birlas.

The question that now arises is how far can we go in allowing Parliament to behave like some kind of a star chamber sitting in judgment on individuals and institutions who have no means of defending themselves without undermining democracy itself. There are a hundred ways in which malefactors can be brought to book—even if they happen to be Birlas—but there are not

many remedies against those who use the freedom of an open democratic society for the express purpose of subverting it."

Now I read the next paragraph. He says that we are using the Parliament for subverting parliamentary democracy. This is what the paper has said and in the end of it, it says: .

"The first thing to do is to establish some norms in public discussion not only in Parliament but outside

it. The century-old libel law is completely obsolete in to-day's conditions. It has become an instrument in the hands of blackmailers and subverters. That law must be changed at once and brought in line with modern law in this matter elsewhere in the democratic world.

Restraining members of Parliament is more difficult but while privilege may continue to apply to what is said in Parliament, that privilege need not extend to published reports of discussions in Parliament."

The editor or the person who has written this article has tried to indicate that the Members, while debating on the Hazari report, adopted the means to subvert parliamentary democracy. So without going into details, I hope that the House will agree to refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, along with the editor, and printer and publisher are equally responsible for the contempt of this House. Through you I request the Leader of the House to have the motion by him amended so that along with the editor, the printer and publisher also can be hauled up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Privileges-Committee is entitled and can certainly call anyone before the Committee.

Has the Member the leave of the House to raise the question?

(No hon. Member dissented.) 787
RSD—5.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the complaint of breach of privilege raised by Shri Chandra Shekhar be referred to the Committee of Privileges with instructions to report by the end of the next session."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

PRIVILEGE ISSUE AGAINST SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJYEE

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमान्, मैं आपके द्वारा एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। गत 30-5-67 को हजारी रपट पर बहस करते हुए कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्य श्री शीलभद्र याजी ने कहा कि "बीबीएन बोस कमिशन पर जब बहस हो रही थी तो सात बी पचास एम पी थे, लेकिन उनमें से एक सदस्य भी रोने पोटने वाला साहू जैन को नहीं मिला। और लोहिया साहब को। लाख रुपया लेता था वह ले कर साइन करवाया "श्री शीलभद्र याजी ने यह पड़्यन्त करके संतोषा व असोपा नेता डा० लोहिया को बदनाम करने के लिए द्वेषपूर्ण ढंग से बार बार मना करने पर भी सदन में इस बात को दोहराया। शीलभद्र याजी का उपरोक्त कथन (1) षड्यन्त्र का फल है, (2) द्वेषपूर्ण है, (3) असत्य, निराधार तथा तथ्यहीन है।

सदन में किसी के विरुद्ध षड्यन्त्र करके द्वेषपूर्ण ढंग से असत्य निराधार बात कहना सदन का अपमान है। इसलिये वह विशेषाधिकार अवहेलना का प्रश्न है।

श्रीमान्, यह पूरी प्रोसीडिंग है उस दिन की। श्री शीलभद्र याजी को बार बार मना किया, मगर मगर आखिर में उन्होंने कहा कि जो मैं कहता हूँ, वह रहा हूँ, मैं समझता हूँ एकदम सही वह