

[श्री जयदेव शर्मा]

प्रश्नों में इन्होंने उल्टे नीति कुछ का एक हथियार का प्रयोग किया।

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: (Barh): May I say something?

Mr. Speaker: Not now.

Shrimati Tarakeshwari Sinha: He has said that he has not been associated with it. He has been associated with one of the sister organisations of ICFTU.

12.18 hrs.

CLARIFICATION BY MINISTER

(Shri Vidya Charan Shukla)

Mr. Speaker: Now, clarification by Shri V. C. Shukla.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Vidya Charan Shukla): Mr. Speaker. Sir, I rise to clarify certain points arising out of the allegations made by Shri A. K. Gopalan, MP, in his statement under rule 357 on 27-3-1967.

When this question first arose on March 11, 1965, the then hon. Speaker observed as follows:

"If someone writes to me that this is incorrect, certainly I would find out from the Member from where he got it and the House has the authority to take action against the Member if any wrong statement is made. That is the usual practice."

After this my comments were called for by the hon. Speaker on 1.7.1965. I furnished my comments and also sent certain documents for Speaker to be satisfied that the allegations made by me were *prima facie* justifiable on the basis of the evidence. No further action was taken by the Speaker. I was therefore well justified in presuming that the material furnished by me had

satisfied the Speaker in view of his observations quoted above. Shri Gopalan may dispute the probative value of evidence. But I logically presumed that the Speaker was convinced of there being *prima facie* ground for what I had alleged. And this is all that I mentioned on this point on 18.3.1967.

About my remarks on the issue of expunction, there is no justification in motives being attributed to me. It is a matter of record and what I spoke from memory could always be checked with the record and duly corrected.

Shri A. K. Gopalan rose—

Mr. Speaker: No further reply now.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): I am not giving any reply. A copy of the statement of the hon. Minister was supplied to me in which there is a sentence which reads:

"The mistake is *bona fide* inadvertence but even for this very minor slip I have hardly any hesitation in saying that I am sorry."

I do not know why this sentence was left out while reading.

Mr. Speaker: The copy supplied to me also contains that statement.

Shri Nambiar (Tiruchirappalli): Let Shri Shukla read out that sentence also.

श्री जयदेव शर्मा (मुंबई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा एक विज्ञापन मुद्रित है। व्यक्तिगत स्पष्टीकरण के बारे में नियम बिलकुल साफ है। यह एक पत्रिका प्रक्रिया है कि जो स्पष्टीकरण लिख कर आप के पास भेजा जाता है उस में कोई त्रुटि नहीं हो सकती है वहाँ तक कि मैं ने बारबार यह कहा है कि इस पत्रिका सम्पादन का दृष्टिकोण करके अगर कोई उस में असत्य वाक्य या गलत बयानी करेगा तो सख्त का अपमान है।

मुद्रणयन साहब के बारे में मैं ने पचासों बक्के कहा है। स्पष्टीकरण का बवाल क्यों आपके पास पैदा गया है वही यहाँ पर पढ़ा जाना चाहिए।

Shri V. Krishnaswami (Cuddalore): Let him show his respect to the House by expressing regret for this. What is the meaning of supplying a copy and then reading only a portion of it? Let us hear it from his mouth.

श्री वसु लिखते : शर्म घाती है ? पढ़िये। उन के मुह से ही सुनना चाहते हैं।

Mr. Speaker: Is it a fact that this sentence was there in the copy supplied to Shri Gopalan also?

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: Yes, Sir. But I omitted it while reading. I read only the factual portion of the statement.

श्री वसु लिखते : वही रेकार्ड में आ जाय।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kandrepur): That is the point. How can he supply a copy and then read only a part of it?

Mr. Speaker: Whenever any Minister makes a statement, he supplies a copy to the Speaker. In this case also I have been supplied with a copy.

श्री वसु लिखते : तो वह रेकार्ड में आ जाय।

Mr. Speaker: A copy has been supplied to Shri Gopalan also. I received this copy only this morning. I was seeing the copy when he was making the statement. The particular sentence which Shri Gopalan has pointed out is there.

Shri V. Krishnaswami: But it was not read out.

Mr. Speaker: Why should the issue be further complicated? That sentence is there in my copy. Nobody can deny it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Unless he reads it, it does not become part of the proceedings. Whatever he might have written to you, unless he reads it in the House, it cannot form part of the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: We will consider that.

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): On a point of order, Sir. A copy of the statement was supplied to you and that is supposed to be authentic. It is on the basis of that copy that you have allowed Shri Shukla to make a statement here. If it is on the basis of that copy that was supplied to you that he was making a statement, he should not depart from the text of that copy which has given to you. On the other hand, this should go on record, that is, the entire statement, and the press should report that particular sentence, which is very important. When Shri Shukla does not read that out it does not form part of the proceedings of the House and the press cannot report the relevant portion of his statement. I submit that you give a ruling on the basis of it.

Mr. Speaker: As it stands, it is the statement signed by him and sent to me. Now he wants to delete a sentence from the statement. Whether it can form part of the proceedings and can be allowed is a thing which I will consider. I will keep it pending.... (Interruption)

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): There are rules.

Mr. Speaker: I know; but suppose he says that he wants to make a statement in clarification and sends a statement today and then tomorrow he says that he does not want to make a statement, you cannot compel him to make the statement.

Shri Umashankar (Pudukkottai): Then he must take your permission. You have taken a decision on the basis of the paper before you and if he wants to change anything he

[Shri Umanath]

should take your permission; otherwise, it would mean giving one understanding to you and then doing entirely contrary to that. It is misleading the Speaker and the House.

Mr. Speaker: I shall consider whether it will form part of the proceedings.

श्री अशु ललिते : प्रो.सिंहस म तो आ ही गग । सवाल यह है कि उनके मूह से निकलना चाहिये । और कोई सवाल नहीं है ।

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu (Diamond Harbour): It is a breach of privilege.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: What I have said in the House becomes a part of the proceedings. I have said that the last sentence has been omitted and I have read out the last sentence so, that becomes a part of the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: It will be recorded in the proceedings as suggested by Shri Gopalan.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): That is a different matter. It has been pointed out to you that the difficulty arises on account of the fact that a Member sends to you a copy of the statement which he intends to read and makes some corrections himself without any warrant and without any prior intimation to you. If here and now you do not give a ruling in regard to this, it would open a floodgate of all kinds of abuses to be practised in this House. I can give a statement which I am proposing to read in the House and read something very different and you will have to hold your hand in regard to whether I do the right thing or not. Therefore, there need be no time taken by you in spite of your being rather too modest about your rights and authority and you have to take a decision here and now. Here is a Member, official or non-

official is a different matter, who proposed to read a statement in the House and sent you a prior copy of it as well as to Shri Gopalan and he read something different by deleting a very crucial sentence or two at the end of it. This is a practice which has got to be censured and for you it is certainly incumbent to say that he should read the entire text of the statement and make it a part of the proceedings.

Shri Hem Barua: Shri Shukla has maligned you and this House. Therefore, he should tender an open apology.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, वह प्रोप्रायटी का सवाल है । श्री शुक्ल ने आप को जो वक्तव्य दिया है वह पूरा नहीं पढ़ा । या तो उन्हें त्रिवश किया जाय पूरा वक्तव्य पढ़ने के लिये या फिर जिस वक्तव्य की आप ने इजाजत दी है वह वक्तव्य रेकार्ड पर नहीं रहना चाहिये । दोनों बातें नहीं हो सकती कि उन का वक्तव्य रेकार्ड पर भी रहे और उस वक्तव्य को पूरा न पढ़ें । मैं श्री शुक्ल से भी अपील करूंगा कि उन्होंने जो कुछ लिख कर दिया है उस को पूरा पढ़ें । उस को पढ़ कर सुनाने से उन को ऐतराज भी क्या हो सकता है । इस में शर्म की कोई बात नहीं है । उन्हें टिप्पण के साथ उम को पढ़ना चाहिये ।

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): I would like to support the point made by Mr. Mukerjee and Mr. Vajpayee. This is a matter of propriety. We are not concerned with the merits of the sentence or the alteration made. But it is correct to say that the hon. Member should be asked to read fully the statement for which he obtained your permission. I think it involves the dignity of the Chair as well as of the House as a whole (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: May I request the Prime Minister to say something in this matter? Here is the statement which was given to me this morning.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): He will say it himself.

Mr. Speaker: I join with the appeal made by the hon. Members that Shri Shukla himself may say it.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: I will read the whole statement again.

I rise to clarify certain points arising out of the allegations made by Shri A. K. Gopalan, M.P. in his statement under rule 357 on 27th March, 1967.

When this question first arose on March 11, 1965, the then Hon'ble Speaker observed as follows:

"If someone writes to me that this was incorrect, certainly I would find out from the Member from where he got it and the House has the authority to take action against the Member if any wrong statement is made. That is the usual practice."

After this, my comments were called for by the Hon'ble Speaker on 1st July, 1965. I furnished my comments and also sent certain documents for the Speaker to be satisfied that the allegations made by me were *prima facie* justifiable on the basis of the evidence. No further action was taken by the Speaker. I was, therefore, well justified in presuming that the material furnished by me had satisfied the Speaker in view of his observations quoted above. Shri Gopalan may dispute the probative value of evidence. But I logically presumed that the Speaker was convinced of there being *prima facie* ground for what I had alleged. And this is all that I mentioned on this point on 18th March, 1967.

About my remarks on the issue of expunction, there is no justification in motives being attributed to me. It is a matter of record and what I spoke from memory could always be checked with the record and duly corrected. The mistake is *bona fide* inadvertence but even for this very minor slip I have hardly any hesitation in saying that I am sorry.

12.25 hrs.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

CENTRAL SILK BOARD

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Dinesh Singh): I beg to move:

"That in pursuance of sub-section (3) (c) of Section 4 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves to serve as members of the Central Silk Board, for the term commencing from the 9th April, 1967."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That in pursuance of sub-section (3) (c) of Section 4 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948, the members of Lok Sabha do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves to serve as members of the Central Silk Board, for the term commencing from the 9th April, 1967."

The motion was adopted.

12.29 hrs.

ELECTION OF DEPUTY SPEAKER

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mr. Kunte had agreed to accept nomination on the basis of an understanding that, as the unanimous choice of the Opposition parties, he was acceptable to the Prime