

by the Court of Additional District Magistrate (Judicial), Panna on the 17th April, 1973."

On 19-11-1969 paragraph 71(8) was amended to read as follows:

"It has been noticed that the rostrum arrangements are not always properly made because the hosts are sometimes unable to bear that cost. As the security of the Prime Minister is the concern of the State, all arrangements for putting up the rostrum, the barriers etc. at the meeting place including that of an election meeting will have to be made by the State Government concerned.

13.29 hrs.

**STATEMENT BY MEMBER RE. ALLEGED INACCURACY IN MINISTER'S REPLY TO S. O. NO. 234 DATED 7TH MARCH, 1973**

**SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour):** On 7-3-1973, I put the following question to Shri F. H. Mohsin, Deputy Minister as a supplementary:—

'If it is or it is not a fact that before November, 1969 the tours undertaken by the Prime Minister for election and other party purposes used to be paid by the party, but since November, 1969, the procedure has been changed and the expenses are now debited to the Exchequer.'

To that the Minister's reply was:

"It is not a fact."

I have given supporting document to prove that before amendment was incorporated in the Blue book entitled "Rules and Instructions covering Prime Minister when on tour and in travel" the relevant provision read as follows:

"71(6) It has been noticed that the rostrum arrangements are not always properly made because the hosts are sometimes unable to bear the cost. As the Prime Minister security is the concern of the State, all arrangements for putting up the rostrum and the barriers at the meeting place will be borne by the State whatever may be the occasion for which the public meeting is called, except election meetings."

In the case of public meetings other than election meetings, all expenditure on the arrangements including provision of rostrum, the setting up of barricades, making lighting arrangements, public address system, etc., will be borne by the State Government. The term 'public meeting' mentioned in this paragraph shall cover not only meetings organised by the State Governments but also those held by the political parties to which the general public has access.

In the case of election meetings, all expenditure on police, setting up of barricades and making lighting arrangements will be borne by the State Government, while expenditure on public address system and any decorative arrangements will be the responsibility of the political party concerned. (The expenditure on all these items may in the first instance be borne by the State Government and then recovered from the political party concerned). In regard to the rostrum, only 25 per cent of the cost of the rostrum or Rs. 2500/- whichever is less, shall be contributed by the party, as the rostrum has to be of certain specifications because of security consideration.

Note.—Even though the political party concerned has to meet the cost of some of the arrangements

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]  
for an election meeting to be addressed by the Prime Minister, the State Governments have to ensure that the arrangements made fully meet the prescribed require-

You will notice that a substantial change was brought in the procedure, in that the expenses which were not being debited to the State Exchequer, prior to 19-11-1969 are now being debited to the State Exchequer. You will agree that what was stated was basically incorrect, wrong and misleading. Therefore, this is a fit case to be send to the Privileges Committee for taking action against the Minister.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN): Sir, I have heard with attention to the statement made by my Hon. friend accusing me of an inaccuracy whilst replying to a supplementary of Starred Question No. 234 on 7th March, 1973. The question which was answered on the 7th March, 1973 related to the percentage of increase in Pay and allowances of Central Ministers *vis-a-vis* other Government servants. The first supplementary Question was regarding the actual expenditure on pay and allowances of Ministers during 1970-71 and 1971-72. The information was furnished in reply. The second supplementary was regarding an explanation for decrease in the expenditure on salary of Ministers. The explanation was also furnished. The third supplementary was by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu and he asked "if it is or it is not a fact that before November 1969 the tours undertaken by Prime Minister for election and other party purposes used to be paid by the party but since November, 1960 the procedure has been changed and the expenditure is now debited to the Exchequer". It was stated in reply that "It is not a fact".

The reply was factually correct because there have been clear instruc-

tions since 1961 that Ministers should not draw any travelling allowance including daily allowance for tours in connection with election work and these instructions had not undergone any change either in 1969 or 1970. matter issued from time to time was laid on the table of the Lok Sabha on 31st July, 1970 in fulfilment of an assurance given to a supplementary question asked by Shri N. G. Ranga arising from Starred Question No. 1171 dated 18th April, 1969 in the Lok Sabha.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu then stated as follows:—

"They are misleading the House. I can prove it by an extract from the Blue Book. In November, 1969, the whole thing was unscrupulously changed."

There was no reply to this observation and the next question was then taken up.

Earlier Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu had, in this letter to the Prime Minister dated 20th August, 1972, referred to expenditure on security arrangements in connection with election meetings addressed by the Prime Minister. Security arrangements are different from expenditure on tours. The factual position in this regard was explained in a reply sent to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu on 9th November, 1972, by Shri R. N. Mirdha, Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs.

The Statement now made by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu alleges that the Deputy Minister in his answer to a supplementary question misled the House as regards the expenditure on security arrangements in connection with election meetings. Starred Question No. 234 answered on the 7th March, 1973 did not primarily relate to the expenditure on security arrangements. It was about tours undertaken by Ministers and Prime Minis-

ter. However, even if Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu's supplementary question on 7th March is taken to relate to expenditure on security arrangements for Prime Minister during election meetings the answer furnished by the Minister is factually correct as explained below:—

My Hon. colleague Shri Mirdha had sent a reply to Shri Bosu's letter written by him to the Prime Minister on 20th August, 1972, in which it was stated that instructions issued in 1958 regarding security arrangements referred to as the 'Blue Book', no doubt, made a distinction between expenditure incurred on security arrangements such as construction of rostrums, barricades, etc. for ordinary meetings addressed by the Prime Minister and election meetings, and to provide that such expenditure should be borne by the State Government, whatever may be the occasion for such a meeting excepting election meetings. The Comptroller and Auditor General, however, had taken the view in the same year 1958 that certain essential security arrangements have to be made during the visits of the Prime Minister to the States irrespective of whether these visits are official or not and that all expenditure incurred by the State Government in moving and police and setting up of barricades and rostrums and making light and loud-speaker arrangements and in transporting them from place to place were appropriate charges on the State Governments. The advice of the Comptroller and Auditor General was circulated to all the States. This procedure went on up to 1969.

Early in 1969, it was considered that a distinction should be made between election meetings and other meetings addressed by the Prime Minister. The State Governments were informed that the expenditure incurred for election meetings on (1) public address system, (2) decorative arrangements and (3) Rs. 2500/- or

25 per cent of the cost of setting up of the rostrum, whichever is less should be required to be contributed by the political party. Thus, whereas there was no uniform practice until 1969 regarding the debit of expenditure on security arrangements in connection with election meetings of the Prime Minister, clear instructions were issued only in 1969 that certain items of expenditure should be met by the Political Party concerned. The 1969 instructions did not impose any new obligation on the Government exchequer; on the other hand, the political party concerned was required to meet certain definite items of expenditure on security arrangements in connection with election meetings. The reply furnished to the supplementary against these facts, was thus factually correct.

Sir, you will appreciate that all the relevant factual information had been furnished to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu long before Starred Question No. 234 was answered on the 7th March, 1973. The answer furnished to the supplementary was also factually correct, whether it is regarded as relating to expenditure on travelling and daily allowances or on security arrangements made in connection with election meetings addressed by the Prime Minister.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Sir, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: On what?

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: On the statement made by the Hon. Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: There can be no point of order or questions on that statement made by the Minister or Member.

I am not allowing it. Shri D. K. Panda.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: No more Interruptions. Shri D. K. Panda.