

RAJYA SABHA

Saturday, the 11th May, 1963/the 21st
Vaisakha, 1885 (Safca)

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

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

THE REGISTRATION OF NEWSPAPERS (CENTRAL) SECOND AMENDMENT RULES, 1963

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R.
BHAGAT): Sir, on behalf of Dr. B. Gopala
Reddy, I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-
section (2) of section 20-A of the Press and
Registration of Books Act, 1867, a copy of the
Ministry of Information and Broadcasting
Notification G. S. R. No. 723, dated the 17th
April, 1963, publishing the Registration of
Newspapers (Central) Second Amendment
Rules, 1963. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-
1346/63].

AUDIT REPORT ON THE ACCOUNTS OF INDIAN CENTRAL JUTE COMMITTEE FOR 1961- 62

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: On behalf of Dr.
Ram Subhag Singh, I beg to lay on the Table
a copy of the Audit Report on the Accounts of
the Indian Central Jute Committee, Calcutta,
for the year 1961-62. [Placed in Library. See
No. LT-1347/63]

REFERENCE TO PRESS REPORT ON SUB JUDICE MATTER

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir,
before you take up Legislative Business,
yesterday, in this House, I was asked not to
refer to certain matters which were considered
to be sub judice when I wanted to deal with
the Defence of India Rules. Today I find a
report in the Times of India which says: 184
R.S.D.—1.

"Official circles today decried as purely
academic the objections raised by five
eminent jurists to certain provisions of the
Defence of India Act."

It is in the Times of India of Delhi today. The
position is this. When I wanted to refer to that
opinion, I was prevented from referring, or at
least sought to be prevented on the ground that
the matter was *sub judice*, but the hon.
Ministers from that side, the Home Minister
and the Minister of State in the Ministry of
Home Affairs were making their opinion
known—when I could not refer to it—today
in that newspaper; the officials are making
their opinion known, yet they would not like
us to discuss in the House, nor would they give
their opinion on the floor of the House. There-
fore, Sir, I submit that you hold an enquiry
into it, whether it is a correct report in the
Times of India. If it is so, Sir, then Mr.
Hajarnavis and Mr. Lai Bahadur of the
Treasury Bench have committed a breach of
privilege. On the one hand they were trying to
stop us here; on the other they are using the
forum of the Press in order to get their views
known to influence the judicial decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, pass this on
to me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am passing
this on; you consider it.

Then, Sir, another little matter, and I finish.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Dr. Gopal Singh.

REFERENCE TO INDO-PAKISTAN TALK'S

DR. GOPAL SINGH (Nominated): I
wanted to bring to your kind notice an urgent
matter of public importance. The House is
rising today and so there

[Dr. Gopal Singh.]

is no time even to give notice of a Short Notice Question. Alarming reports are appearing in the Press that a third party's presence has been agreed to by the Government of India at the Indo-Pakistan parleys. If so, I would . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot allow this question. There is no time to admit it and then get a reply.

DR. GOPAL SINGH: I only wanted the Government to assure us that the sovereignty of this country wDI not be negotiable.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA" (West Bengal): It is a very important thing though on the last day; the hon. Member has raised it and he has raised it by reading it in the newspapers, a third party intervening in the discussion. I would like to know where we stand with regard to this matter. We have not decided that there should be a tripartite discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot raise any question any time. I should have been informed well in advance. Just now I do not know and I cannot say anything.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA; You may be good enough, Sir, to convey it.

REFERENCE TO LAW MINISTER'S STATEMENT

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): About the other thing, Sir, the day before yesterday I mentioned in the course of my speech about the Law Minister's statement in which he criticise^ the Judges. In this matter, again, yesterday a large number of members of the Supreme Court Bar Association including ex-Judges of the High Court and senior Advocates had requisitioned an emergent meeting of the Supreme Court Bar Association to consider these remarks, but for want *at* time required for *notice*, a formal

meeting was not possible owing to the Court *closing* for the *summer* vacation. The informal meeting was however attended by about fifty persons, in which they have condemned the Law Minister's statement made on the floor of the House. Was it not right for the Government, when I brought it to their notice that the said statement was being criticised by the Calcutta Bar Association, to say something on it? Nothing was said. I and now, the Supreme Court Bar Association, at an informal meeting, has criticised that statement made in the Lok Sabha; it has gone to the Press. I should like to know where we stand. The Government told me not to deal with *sub judice* matters but they make criticisms against the Judges, which evoke this kind of condemnation by the Supreme Court Bar Association. We should like to know where the Government stands, what is its mentality and attitude with regard to the Judges.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You would pass this also on to me.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Government is not responsible to the Supreme Court Bar Association.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I now announce the nominations to the various Committees.

NOMINATIONS TO THE PANEL OF VICE-CHAIRMEN

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under sub-rule (1) of rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I hereby nominate the following Members to the Panel of Vice-Chairmen.

1. Shri M. P. Bhargava
2. Shri Akbar AH Khan
3. Shri M. Govinda Reddy
4. Shrimati Jahanara Jaipal Singh