

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : I did not say the Law Ministry of the Government of India ; I said the Law Ministry of Madhya Pradesh.

SHRI NATH PAI : What did you do on the 19th ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : On the 19th I discussed the matter with the Law Minister.

SHRI NATH PAI : Since he said in Parliament the other day that a public document before the Supreme Court cannot be placed on the Table of the House since then I am worried about him. Now, coming back to my question, what about an answer to them. He can say "No". Can he give an assurance to all future contestants that in case they lose the election or a case and they want the services of the Attorney-General, will it be made available to them ? 'Are we not going to make an evil out of all this ? Should we not show some semblance of political decency ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : The rules about consulting the Attorney-General are obvious Any State Government or a layman can consult him provided it is not against the interests of the Central Government. Further, the Attorney-General is entitled to give his private opinion also ; nobody can come in the way. If the Government of India feel that it is a question which is likely to be raised in this House, or is likely to come up in the course of administration, it is certainly entitled to seek that opinion.

SHRI NATH PAI : How is D. P. Mishra or his election . . .

MR. SPEAKER : This is over. I am going to the next item (Interruption)

11.50 hrs.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGE AGAINST EDITOR OF "ORGANISER"

MR. SPEAKER : On the 18th March, 1969, Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah had sought to raise a question of privilege regarding certain comments published in the "Organiser" dated the 15th March, 1969. I had

then said that I would ask the Editor to state what he had to say in the matter.

I have now received a letter dated the 21st March, 1969 from the Editor of the "Organiser" in which he has stated *inter alia* as follows :

"I must say I am very sorry that that half-sentence crept into the piece.

We are sorry for that comment more so because we know Shri Venkatasubbaiah to be a distinguished leader, an accomplished Parliamentarian and, above all, a Hindu proud of his Hinduism."

In view of this, I think the matter may be dropped. I take it that the House agrees.

11.5 hrs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER : Before we take up the other business, I would like to say that today we are sitting because the BAC decided that the Budget Demands could not be postponed. We will have to take up to the Demands on Wednesday ; so, we had only two days—Monday and Tuesday—and there were the Ordinances, which we had to pass. In addition to the Ordinance, the Assam Reorganisation Bill is also there. It is supposed to be very important. Members came and said that it must be finished now so that the Rajya Sabha could take it into consideration before they adjourned. So, we decided in the BAC that these Ordinances, three and four of them are there like the wakfs Ordinance and the special powers to the military, could be finished very quickly because all the Members thought that they were not very controversial and on Monday afternoon we could take up the Assam Reorganisation Bill, devote the whole of Tuesday to it and finish it on that day so that on Wednesday we could take up the discussion on the Demands. I hope, hon. friends will help me in finishing these things.