

were exporting woollen cloth, should be 12 and not 13, as given in the statement attached to the reply. The names of mills at Sr 6 and 12 in the statement, viz, Supreme Woollen Mills and Khushiram Dwarkanath Mills Limited, Bombay, are to be deleted from the reply given, as these mills were not direct exporters and were exporting indirectly, on the other hand the name of another mill, viz, M/s Sailesh Textile Industries, Bombay, has to be included.

- (ii) The name of 'Modella Woollen Mills' appearing at Sr 2 in the statement may be read as 'Modella Textile Industries, Private Limited'

- (B) In part (b), the following names of countries are to be added to the reply given and the names of two countries viz, Bulgaria and South Yemen Republic, are to be deleted —

USSR, Switzerland Syria
Jamaica, Fiji Australia
France, Italy Lebanon
Nigeria Ghana Muscat
Bangladesh Mauritius
Uganda, Aden, Malaysia
and Cyprus

2 A statement indicating reasons of delay for amending the reply is attached

3 An Assurance was given in respect of Part (c) of the Question. Necessary information in this respect is now available and is given in the statement laid on the Table of the House [Placed in Library See No LT-8862/74].

The delay in carrying out the corrections to the replies given against Parts (a) and (b) of Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No 2603 on 1-12-1972 is due to the fact that it is only while compiling the information required for reply to part (c), that the omissions in the information given in respect of part (a) and (b) came to light. Hence these corrections have been carried out along with the submission of the reply to part (c) of the Question.

(Interruptions)

12 hrs

MR SPEAKER Do not get up without my permission

श्री वन्दे मैत्रेय (हाथर)

MR SPEAKER Nothing will go on record. When I am standing you are not called to speak. Before you start your programme allow me to read the ruling on the pending Goenka issue and other issues.

12 05 hrs

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE
AGAINST SHRI R N GOENKA
MP—contd

MR SPEAKER Sarvashri Priyas Ranjan Das Munshi, Bhogendra Jha, Indrajit Gupta, S M Banerjee, Ramavatar Shastri, K P Unnikrishnan, D C Goswami, Darbara Singh, Shashi Bhushan and Vayalar Ravi gave notices of question of privilege against Shri R N Goenka, MP arising *inter alia* from the following news report published in the Patriot dated the 4th December, 1974 —

“Three directors of the Indian Express group are to stand trial for cheating, forgery and criminal

conspiracy. Besides the directors—Mr. R. N. Goenka, his son, Mr B. D. Goenka and Mr. B. D. Goenka's wife, Mrs. Saroj Goenka—two other employees of the Express group of companies will stand trial on similar charges.

The case was committed for trial by the Special Metropolitan Magistrate of Madras to the court of the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, New Delhi on Saturday....

The prosecution case was that the accused entered into a criminal conspiracy in 1968, to cheat the bank, commit forgeries and falsify the account books and stock records of the companies with a view to obtaining excess cash credit facilities from the bank."

Sarvashri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi Bhogendra Jha, S. M. Banerjee, K. P. Unnikrishnan, D. C. Goswami, Darbara Singh and Shashi Bhushan made their submissions in the House on the 13th and 16th December, 1974 regarding the admissibility of their notices. The members referred to the alleged charges against Shri Goenka and contended that the impugned conduct of Shri Goenka was derogatory to the dignity of the House and inconsistent with the high standards expected from Members of Parliament.

Shri R N. Goenka made his submission in the House on the 18th December, 1974. He stated that these allegations related to a period when he was not a member of the House. He added that he was not in a position to go into the merits of the case since the matter was pending in a court of law and that he would present his rebuttal in the court. He also submitted that the allegations and charges made by some members against him should not have been permitted to be made and pleaded that a question of privilege against a member could arise only if the member had been guilty of misconduct or

misdeemeanour as a member of the House.

As stated in my ruling in the House on the 2nd December, 1974, in order to constitute a breach of privilege or contempt of the House, the misconduct of a member should relate to business in the House. In the present case, as the impugned conduct of Shri R. N. Goenka does not relate to business in the House, I do not give my consent to the notices of question of privilege.

The Chair shall in future disallow notices of questions of privilege in *in fine* where it is not clearly shown that the alleged breach of privilege is connected with the business of the House.

There may, however, be cases where it may be alleged that a member's conduct involves moral turpitude and to that extent the member may be deemed to be guilty of lowering the dignity of the House. In such cases, appropriate procedure should be followed and the matter should not be brought as a question of privilege. I have already ruled in my ruling of 2nd December, 1974, that the rule of *sub judice* does not come in the way of disciplinary jurisdiction of the House. But the Chair and the House will have to consider each case on its merit.

12.10 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES
AGAINST A.I.R.—contd.

MR SPEAKER Yesterday, Shri R. N Goenka sought to raise a question of privilege against the All India Radio for broadcasting in its news bulletin and in the broadcast entitled "Today in Parliament" on the 4th December, 1974, certain matters as proceedings of the House which in fact were not in the official record of the