

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR:
the statement on the
Appendix XXXVIII,
No. 23.]

Sir, I lay
Table. [Sec
Annexure

against me and others who stand-against
separatism. Do you think such phrases like
'goonda leader', 'Razakar leader' and so on
should be used?

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

MB. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform
Members that the following message has been
received from the President:

"I have received with great satisfaction
the expression of thanks by the Members of
the Rajya Sabha for the Address I delivered
to both the Houses of Parliament assembled
together on the 18th April, 1962."

REFERENCE TO A REPORT ON PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE IN "MURASOLI"

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal):
Sir, I wish to draw your attention to a matter
of rather some great importance to this House
and to me personally. A report has appeared in
the "Murasoli", the D.M.K. paper of the 5th,
edited by Mr. Karunanidhi, the Deputy Leader
of the D.M.K in the Madras Legislature Party
of my speech in this House on the President's
Address. In that issue of the paper it is said, 'Is
he a Communist leader or a goonda leader?'
Then it is said that 'when he got his applause
from the House his blind fury overpowering
him he spoke like a goonda leader. This is
how the Communist leader, Mr. Bhupesh
Gupta, spoke, like the Raza-kar leader,
Kassim Rizvi.' Then a cartoon is given in
which I and the Congressmen are shown as
goon das. The Congressmen can look after
themselves but here I find I am shown as an
aggressive gootaid. I am a very humble man,
you see, but here an aggressive goonda is
shown and Mr. Annadurai is standing here like
a saint. The paper naturally wants to provoke
the supporters of the D.M.K.

I cherish the freedom of the Press more
than I cherish my personal position as a
Member of this House. Even so, I would like
to draw the attention of this House to this
question of highly provocative publication in
the Press. They can criticise me in any way
they like.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Is it
not a matter of privilege?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He calls me a
goonda. If I were touchy like Acharya
Kripalani I think this case; comes easily under
breach of privilege and that paper can be
hauled up. I would not like that because I wish
to make my position and that of my party
clear. I would not like the freedom of the Press
to be tampered with even if the D.M.K. leader
exceeds his privilege in this manner. Even so, I
would say that you should take note of it and
see what should be done. I do not want to
punish but I think you will make the opinion of
the House known at least to the country that
even if we criticise such people it is open to
them to criticise us in whatever manner they
like but certainly it is not a right thing, when I
criticise the separatism of the D.M.K. for them
to call me a goonda or a Razakar leader and
instigate the D.M.K. followers against me and
others in this manner. It is a gross breach of
privilege. However, I would not bring a
privilege motion here but I would like that the
opinion of the House should be made known.
Mr. Annadurai in his speeches was telling that
the Prime Minister was very-mild on his
demand for separation and that he noted
support for it in the House when he spoke. All
these things are rather fantastic falsehood. I
can never think of the Prime Minister being in
any way in support of separation nor is it a
fact that the House expresses directly or
indirectly

any support to the fantastic speech of Mr. Annadurai when he demanded separation. This is what is going on and I think you will take note of it. But I am not bringing a motion of privilege because I think the privilege of the Press is much more honourable and more to be cherished than the privilege of a humble Member like me. None the less I place it in the possession of the House.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh) : May I seek a clarification? Under what rule has my hon. friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, referred this matter to the House? There is a clear contradiction in his speech. Either this is a matter of breach of privilege or it is not. Under what rule are we going to discuss this matter?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He is a new Member. He should have known about the motion of privilege against "Blitz", a motion that was . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: I joined the motion but there is no formal motion here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The rule is—here is a question of breach of privilege—according to our House which you are a newcomer . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: You address the Chair.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I tell you, here is the generosity of the Communist Party. We do not raise it as a matter of privilege although according to the case law and the precedent laid down by the other House, this comes right under it. Even so, I want that these people should be told how they should behave. Are you satisfied, Mr. Vajpayee?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Now that this matter has been brought to your notice and to the notice of the House, it should be referred to the Committee of Privileges. It is not a

•

question of breach of privilege vis-à-vis Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, but it is a question of breach of the privilege of the House. And the practice in other democratic countries in this respect has been that some senior Member of the House, preferably the Leader of the House, moves a motion and thereupon such matters are referred to the Privileges Committee. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may try to be generous but this may be taken as a precedent for the future. So, I would request you, Sir, to refer this matter to the Committee of Privileges.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have got a copy of the paper and the translation. Here is the paper and here is the translation. I can lay it on the Table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In what language is it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is in the great Tamil language. The great Tamil people are maligned by Mr. Annadurai by making this demand for separation . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That will do.

श्री बिमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया
(मध्य प्रदेश): माननीय सभापति महोदय, मैं सदन के सामने यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे रेलवे मंत्री महोदय ने
Demands for Grants for Expenditure of the Central Government on Railways for 1962-63 पेश किया था.

उसमें लोक सभा के अन्दर उन्होंने एक अड्डेस पेश किया था और कोरिजेंडम भी पेश किया था। व दोनों चीजें उन्होंने वहाँ पर पेश कीं, किन्तु यहाँ पर पेश नहीं कीं। इतना ही नहीं, जो १० लाख ३७ हजार रुपये का फर्क है, वह भी उसमें है। इसके