

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I have to make a request. We cannot make comments on the statement but I demand that discussion be permitted on a very vital issue.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप नोटिस दीं जि। ।

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I have already given you notice.

PROF. N. G. RANGA: (Guntur): what is the use of discussion...

RELEASE OF MEMBER

MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following telegram dated 16 December, 1981, from the District Magistrate, Ujjain, to-day:—

"I have the honour to inform you that Shri Satyanarayan Jatiya, Member of Lok Sabha who was arrested on 15-12-1981 for obstructing the rail traffic at Ujjain Railway Station was released on 15-12-1981 at 8.30 P.M. on assurance of maintaining peace."

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJAPAYEE (New Delhi): There is no mention about the beating.

12.29 hrs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS BY MEMBERS

MR. SPEAKER: Dr. Swamy.

SHRI N. K. SHEJALKAR (Gwalior): I have a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

SHRI N. K. SHEWALKAR: I want to draw your attention to Rule 357. It mentions that explanation can be made only regarding something which has been said in the House. On a previous decision of the House itself in Lok Sabha debates—actually I am not

quoting the commentary on procedure by Shakhdar at page 351 but—on 4-6-1971 there was exactly a point which arose before the House. If you permit me, I shall read out.

It was said:

"In the newspapers of June 2, 1971, news report has appeared"

Explanation was being given by Prof. Madhu Dandavate then....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Why do you involve me in this debate?

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: I have to quote what is already there. I am not involving you.

MR. SPEAKER: I have with me the explanation of Prof. Dadhu Dandavate.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: To make my point clear, the point was raised that contradiction should have been issued outside the House. The House has nothing to do with the statement. If Members of Parliament issue statement, it has nothing to do with the House.

"Shri S. M. Benerjee: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I think, your point of order is correct.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: It should be expunged.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJAPAYEE: I entirely agree with the views of Shri Dandavate, but this is not the place to make a contradiction.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: He can issue a contradiction to the press but this forum should not be used for that.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The signatures were collected in this very House.... (Interruptions.)"

It was said further:

"MR. SPEAKER: This relates to something which happened outside the House. If the signatures are

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

collected in this House, they are not on record. Everything is done by hand or silently. Nothing is spoken here.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Even the collection of signatures is not correct."

It was challenged:

"MR. SPEAKER: It is without our knowledge.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, I am not in the habit of violating the rules of procedure. Therefore, I met you in your Chamber and said, "If you give me the permission to make the clarification, then only I will rise in the House". Only after your explicit permission, I rose to make the clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: It is my mistake."

And thus it was expunged. Therefore, my submission is that any explanation....

MR. SPEAKER: It is on record. I have seen with me. It is here with me.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: Therefore, my point of order is...

MR. SPEAKER: Furthermore, Mr. Shejwalkar, what I am referring to now is not only in the press but this is something on the record of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: This has been expunged.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: Therefore, Sir, firstly, if I am right, the last paragraph does not concern the hon. Member regarding whom the explanation is being given. Sir, hon. Member Shri Tiwari said something. So if any explanation is allowed to him, that is all right. I have nothing to say if that can be done. But any further explanation regarding anything which has been stated outside, by the press or by any other hon. Member, will not be and cannot be referred to in this statement. This is my submission.

MR. SPEAKER: This is what has come on record.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: That is why I am referring to this. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you interrupting?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I will give this much information that my observation in the House was ultimately not expunged from the record.

MR. SPEAKER: I have seen it here. Not only that. I have said that. I see that something is on the record and accordingly I am allowing. I think, your point is not well taken up.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: At that time, the point of order was raised. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you interrupting? No, why are you doing it? Please sit down. You are unnecessarily butting in. This is very bad. You should not disturb. I have allowed him. I am sitting in the Chair.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: Sir, the difference there and here is this. There, it was not expunged because it was recorded. The statement was made by Shri Dandavate. Here, Sir, I am raising before actually the statement is made. That is the difference.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I have something which I have already on the record. That is why I have allowed. Now, Dr. Swamy.

SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR: Regarding that I have nothing to say. I am saying about para 2 of the.....

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North East): On 4th December, 1981, Prof. K. K. Tewari, while seeking to raise a question of privilege against Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, a Member of this House, is on record as having stated *inter alia*:—

"I have given a notice under Rule 222 against Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee who has called Dr. Subra-

maniam Swamy as a CIA agent. He has based it on his knowledge as Minister of External Affairs. The Probe has published an interview by Mr. Vajpayee where Mr. Vajpayee says that Dr. Swamy is a CIA agent."

The aforementioned statement of Prof. Tewari has received wide publicity in the Press and therefore, as I mentioned in the House yesterday, it is not possible for me to remain silent lest it is misunderstood. I would like to state with all the strength at my command that I have no connection whatsoever with the CIA and the allegation made, implied or threatened, is without any basis whatever and is totally baseless and malicious.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar): By whom?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I would like to reiterate that if Shri Vajpayee has any evidence about the alleged CIA connection, he should have the courage either to substantiate it or, in all fairness withdraw it unequivocally and apologise to the House.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (New Delhi): Sir, what has been published as my interview in a journal from Allahabad has been referred to in the House first in a privilege motion against me by an hon. Member from the Treasury Bench and then in a personal explanation by an hon. Member belonging to the Opposition.

The privilege motion was not admitted by you in your wisdom even though I would not have raised any objection if you had admitted it. Now, you have permitted the hon. Member from Bombay (North East) to make a statement by way of personal explanation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is that? (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Do some mental work also मुक्त में सारा करना चाहते हो, We are not going to solve all the riddles for you.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It has often happened before that when an allegation was made in the House by one Member against another, the Member accused would protest that the immunity provided by parliamentary privilege was being abused to malign him. The Member making the allegation was challenged to make the statement outside the House and thus expose himself to the risk of defamatory proceedings.

This controversy is about a matter published in the press outside.

As I have already informed you, I have filed a complaint to the Press Council against the journal for publishing my so-called interview. The Press Council has been set up by an Act of Parliament and is presided over by a retired Judge of the Supreme Court. As the Council is seized of the matter, I do not wish to say anything further except that I have never believed in the politics of character assassination and during more than two decades of my Parliamentary career I have tried my best to maintain a certain standard in my behaviour with regard to my colleagues.

It is open for the hon. Member from Bombay (South East) to wait for the verdict of the Press Council or to approach a court of law to seek redress.

PROF. K. K. TIWARY: Sir, I rise on a point of order.... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order on this.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: You have allowed personal explanation. Why don't you allow me?

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing about this.

(Interruptions)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, two very serious statements have been made. Rather than waiting for the matter to be decided by the Press Council, if Mr. Vajpayee himself if it appears that the interview is not

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

correct, says here that it is incorrect and no allegation has been made....
(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is allowed on this. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

Shri Bhishma Narain Singh.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH): Sir, I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-fourth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 16th December, 1981."

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV (Azamgarh): Mr. Speaker, Sir....

MR. SPEAKER: I have not allowed it.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: I am on a point of order. My point of order is under rule 290. I have given notice of two amendments to the motion moved by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs.

I have given two amendments. I wanted that the House should discuss certain things. You have now ruled that it is not within the purview and that the amendment is out of order. I have been conveyed by your office that this amendment can be only about allotment of time. Rule 290 reads:

"At any time after the report has been presented to the House, a motion may be moved that the House agrees or agrees with amendments or disagrees with the report."

Provided that an amendment may be moved that the report be referred back to the Committee either without limitation or with reference to any particular matter."

My amendment is that the Report be referred back to the Committee because, I have said, the issue of unemployment allowance of Rs. 150 per month to unemployed youth and the issue about the Mandal Commission's Report regarding reservation for backward classes in the services should be discussed by this House in this Session. When, under rule 290, my amendment is in order, I would like to know how you have ruled it out.

MR. SPEAKER: This is the convention; it was in the Business Advisory Committee that we decided because the Business Advisory Committee comprises of representatives of the whole of the Opposition and the ruling Party, and to amend the Report of that Committee is not good.

In the Business Advisory Committee the Speaker mentioned that according to well-established convention, amendments to the motion for adoption of a Report of the Business Advisory Committee were not generally moved; on rare occasions when amendments were moved, these related only to allocation of time different from the one recommended in the Report of the Business Advisory Committee for an item, but no amendment related to inclusion of an entirely new item of business; however, from 1980, Members had been giving notices of amendments for introducing new items for discussion in the Report of the Business Advisory Committee. That was why did not....

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: We decided in the Business Advisory Committee, as a convention.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: How can the Committee go against the rules?