

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 to 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-a-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.

CIRCULATION OF PAPERS TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

श्री बिमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया
(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 Rail-
ways for 1962-63 पेश किया था,
उसमें लोक सभा के अन्दर उन्होंने
एक अडेडम पेश किया था और कैबिनेटम
भी पेश किया था। व दोनों चीजें उन्होंने
वहाँ पर पेश की, किन्तु यहाँ पर पेश नहीं की।
इतना ही नहीं, जो १० लाख ३७ हजार
रुपये का फर्क है, वह भी उसमें है। इसके

अलावा १६ आइटम्स ऐसे हैं जिन में दुरुस्ती की गई है। इसमें दो बातें हो सकती हैं, एक तो यह है कि मंत्रालय से हमारे सेक्रेटरियट को ये कागजात आये हों और इन्होंने हमको सर्कुलिट न किया हो और दूसरी यह है कि मंत्रालय की तरफ से ही ये कागजात पेश न किये गये हों। ये दोनों स्थितियाँ हो सकती हैं। अगर मंत्रालय की तरफ से नहीं पेश किये गये तो यह सचमुच हमारे राज्य सभा के सदस्यों के प्रिविलेज पर बहुत बड़ा कुठाराघात है और उसके लिये मैं श्रीमान् से अलग से अनुमति लूँगा। अगर सेक्रेटरियट की इसमें गलती है तो श्रीमान् जैसा चाहें वैसा विचार करें। मेरा यह निवेदन है कि मैं यह घटना अप्रार्क सामने इस लिये लाया हूँ कि आप इस पर विचार करके जो भी योग्य मार्ग दर्शन हो उसे दिलवाने की कृपा करें। जो भी मुझे जानकारी मिली है, उसके अनुसार मैं यही कह सकता हूँ कि ये अडेण्डम और कॉरिजेंडम वहाँ पर सर्कुलिट कर दिये गये हैं जब कि यहाँ पर सर्कुलिट नहीं हुये हैं।

श्री गोरीकुण्ठ विजयवर्गीय (मध्य प्रदेश) : क्या ये सब कागजात भी यहाँ पेश किये जायेंगे ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point he raises is that in addition to the Report an addendum was circulated in the Lok Sabha, but it was not circulated to Members of this House. Why was it not done? That is what he asks.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SARDAR SWARAN SINGH): Sir, on the 2nd of May, when introducing the Demand in the Lok Sabha, I placed before that House a small amendment which did not alter the total amount that was asked for under Demand No. 16, but only from one head to another, namely, from 'non-charged or

voted' to 'charged'. This was due to a little difference of about Rs. 11 lakhs or so, on account of a certain arbitration award received after presentation of the Budget. After making that statement, on the next day, that is, on the 3rd, the amendment was circularised in the other House. Therefore, it was following my statement there, that some action had been taken on the following day to circularise the addendum. The intention was not to withhold it from this House, because the Demand in that form, that is, in the amended form, will be before the House, the Appropriation Bill being based on that. I think that this matter was discussed with the Secretariat of Rajya Sabha on the last similar occasion in 1957, and it was pointed out that it was enough if, a day prior to the actual discussion of the Appropriation Bill, the amended statement or whatever is the correction, is circularised. I did not mean any discourtesy, and, in the present form, the Appropriation Bill will be discussed on the 10th. It is, therefore, before the House in this form. I am not sure whether it was obligatory to circularise the addendum before the discussion, that is, before the time of starting the discussion of the Appropriation Bill in which a certain change had been incorporated. But if that is the desire of this House or of you, Mr. Chairman, Sir, then certainly we will abide by whatever directions are given. But I would like to assure the House that no discourtesy of any type was intended by me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When these things are circulated and when additional matter is also circulated, it should be done in both the Houses. I do not want to bring the Secretariat into this business. It has nothing to do with the Secretariat. It is a matter between us and the Ministry. I say, as he said, he did not mean any kind of discourtesy, but this will be done.

Mr. Ramgopal Gupta.