

REFERENCE TO REPORTED REQUEST BY THE U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT FOR A COPY OF THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECHES IN THE U.S.S.R.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I invite your attention to the news item which appeared in the Hindustan Times of the 27th September to the effect that the U.S. State Department has taken exception to certain remarks or observations made in the speeches by our President while he was visiting the U.S.S.R. ! and that the State Department has also asked for the full text of these j speeches. It is an extraordinary thing. I If the news is correct, it is quite clear that it has been sponsored by the American authorities here.

MR, CHAIRMAN: I am not in a position to tell whether the news is correct or not. I have passed on the notice to the Government. You should give them time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The Government should make a statement and tell us. We have not seen any such thing before. It is an insult to the dignity of our President and to our country. The Americans have no authority to supervise the speeches of fine President of India.

REFERENCE TO NOTICE OF MOTION OF PRIVILEGE ARISING OUT OF THE ARREST OF PROF. M. B. LAL

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA R.SDDY (Mysore): Sir, I have given notice of a privilege motion with regard to the arrest of Prof. Mukut Behari Lai. It is a serious matter. I hope the statement will be made tomorrow. The other day you were pleased to say that the information was received through wireless. That has been already- made out in the letter that you read out. So it is a serious breach of privilege that has been committed

by the authorities concerned, and it is a fit case to be referred to the Privilege Committee & o that proper action may be taken against the erring officer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): You see, Sir, it has never happened before in the last 12 years that we got the information read out to the House after the person, who was arrested, has been released. Hon. Prof. M. B. Lai is here. Now we are getting information as to what happened to him. It is quite clear that the authorities who were responsible for this arrest did not take prompt action. They should have sent telegrams and letters to you, Sir, immediately after having arrested him or prosecuted him. That was not done. This thing, I think, is unprecedented except for once when it happened some years ago. Therefore, it should go to the Privilege Committee which should go into the question. It is not a question of some individual Member and so on. It is a question of the privilege of the House and the honourable House should be seized of the matter. Unless you yourself investigate to which we have no objection, *suo moto*, alternatively the course is for the Privilege Committee to be seized of this matter and make such recommendation, as they think fit, for your consideration and decision.

The DEPUTY MINISTER in the MINISTRY of HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI L. N. MISHRA) I may submit.

Sir, as you know, the District Magistrate, Bulandshahr, after the arrest of Mr. Mukut Behari Lai sent a radio-gram (wireless) which is an authorised means of communication. It ! was also followed by a telegram, and then this letter which has been read out by your goodself.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): It was very late.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: The same day. The wireless was sent on the 19th. The copy of the letter that I have got with me, is addressed to the

-Secretary. In that letter the District Magistrate has said that immediately lent a wireless message to the Rajya Sabha Secretariat as also a telegram. And later he sent this letter to you through a special messenger. He meant no disrespect to the House or to the hon. Members and he thought that a wireless message was enough and he could forward the letter later. Hence no breach of privilege has been committed.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI (Uttar Pradesh): My hon. friend is misinformed. He does not know the practice. The practice of the House is that we do not rely on telegrams or wireless messages unless a letter is received by the Chairman of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I have looked into the matter. Therefore, I am ready for a statement.

PROF. Mukut Behari Lai was arrested at Bulandshahr at 3-30 P.M. September 19, 1964. The same evening the Superintendent of Police, Bulandshahr sent a wireless message to me intimating that Prof. Mukut Behari Lai was arrested for an offence under sections 143 and 186 of the Indian Penal Code. In accordance with our practice intimation of this to Members was held over pending the receipt of a formal written communication. I have just now read out to the House the formal communication from the Magistrate which I received on the 26th morning. I have also informed the House that on the 27th morning a written communication was received from the Magistrate that Prof. Mukut Behari Lai was, after a trial lasting for two days, acquitted by the Judicial Magistrate, Bulandshahr on September 25. I may further inform the House that the District Magistrate has in a written communication furnished the facts relating to the arrest, trial and acquittal of Prof. Mukut Behari Lai and has explained the steps taken by the authorities at Bulandshahr to give intimation of the arrest of Prof.

Mukut Behari Lai to me. He has submitted that if any formality required by our Rules has not been properly fulfilled, the same has been due to inadvertence, which he greatly regrets.

I expressed my concern over the matter in the House on September 25, 1964. I hope and believe that the Ministry of Home Affairs will impress upon the authorities concerned that they should be very prompt in sending such communications. The Ministry would no doubt also impress upon all concerned that a written message or a telegraphic communication must invariably be followed by a formal communication in writing without any delay whatsoever.

In view of the fact that a wireless message was sent to me immediately after the arrest of Prof. Mukut Behari Lai and also in view of the explanation furnished and regrets expressed by the District Magistrate, I am of the view that we need not pursue the matter as a question of privilege.

REFERENCE TO U.P. GOVERNOR'S STATEMENT ON OPJSSA

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): About the U.P. Governor, the hon. Minister said that he would make a statement. He has the material now.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA) : I have not got the materials. We have the communication from the U.P. Governor but the matter has been referred to the Law Ministry for examination and as soon as it comes, we will communicate it.

THE WAKF (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964—continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister had just concluded his speech moving the motion. Shri Jamal Moideen may speak. We will sit till 1.30.