

[Shri P. Ramamurti]
police, and the Committee held that it was a case of breach of privilege.”

Therefore, this question of breach of privilege arises because a Member of Parliament cannot be treated like others.

Since Shri A. K. Gopalan has written to you that he has been definitely detained for two hours, it is definitely a question of privilege which involves the point whether a Member can be detained or not. These are facts. Therefore, it is not a question of getting information.

Mr. Speaker: As I had said earlier, and as I would suggest even now, I am prepared to admit a calling attention-notice on this. (*Interruptions*).

Shri E. K. Nayanar (Palghat): He was detained for two hours. So, it is a question of privilege. We are opposed to its being admitted as a calling-attention-notice.

Shri A. Sreedharan (Badagara): He was detained for two hours. So, it is a privilege matter and not a matter for a calling-attention-notice

Mr. Speaker: I am admitting only the calling-attention-notice and not the privilege notice, and that calling-attention-notice will be taken up when we get the time for it.

12.10 hrs.

RE. CALLING ATTENTION TO
MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE—contd.

(*Procedure*)

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): Shri Samar Guha was absent when you had called his name. He was out for a little while, under the impression that the short notice question would come up and that would take some time.

Mr. Speaker: How can I go back to an earlier item now? How can I go back upon a principle? If I make an exception in the case of one Member, then every day, I shall have to do it for other Members also.

Shri A. Sreedharan (Badagara): We are not satisfied with the calling-attention-notice only. We want that it should be taken up as a privilege motion.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot make an exception in the case of one Member today because every day the same thing may happen. If I go back to an earlier item and allow it to be taken up now, then every day this may happen, and a Member who is absent when a particular item is called may come half an hour later and say that he was busy somewhere else and, therefore, the item might be taken up. I would not go back to the earlier item now.

Shri Samar Guha (Contai): This is a very important question. It relates to the rights of the minority communities. So, I request that as a special case, this may be allowed.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: He thought that the short notice question would take some time.

Mr. Speaker: I am not responsible for it.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: I suggest that you may kindly make an exception in this case. There are not even five Members, but there is only one Member and it would take only about two or three minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I know that. The answer can be given too. But it is not a question of one Member or two Members. But it is a question of the principle. After going ahead and disposing of one or two more items, how could I go back to an earlier item? It is not a question of time at all. I am not worried about the time at all. Yesterday, for instance, we had spent the whole day on one item. So, it is not the time factor about which I am worried. After I have gone to the next item and we have begun to discuss the next item, how could I go back to an earlier item? If I do that today, then tomorrow, if some other Members also want it, then what can

I tell them? Hon. Members may tell them.

That is what I want.

Therefore, now I am sorry; I have gone ahead (*Interruptions*).

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You may fix some other time, say 5 P.M. today.

Mr. Speaker: We will see. I cannot say anything now.

Shri K. Lakkappa (Tumkur): On a point of order. Under the rules of procedure a calling attention notice has been admitted and time fixed for it. Now Shri Samar Guha was here in the House only, but he had just gone out to collect some papers. He was within the precincts of Parliament House. Therefore, the calling attention notice should be taken up, now.

Mr. Speaker: A very valuable suggestion. He will kindly resume his seat. Or has he finished his speech?

Shri K. Lakkappa: I am not making a speech. I am only saying when my colleague, Shri Samar Guha was called, he had just gone out to collect some papers and he had returned immediately. So it should be taken up now.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंबै) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी प्रार्थना केवल इतनी है कि गोपालन साहब का जो मामला है, . . .

Mr. Speaker: After I have given the ruling, what is the point in raising this?

श्री मधु लिमये : अगर आपको मेरी प्रार्थना जबे, तो आप उसको मॉरि, वर्ना मैं बैठ जाऊंगा।

'फ्रीडम फॉर इरेस्ट, मालेस्टेशन, अब-स्क्वशन गंड हेरामेट' को 'मैं' के अनुसार एक बड़ा विरोधकार माता जा रहा है और श्री गोपालन का मामला उनके अनुरोध अन्त है। पिछले साल श्री डांगे, श्री रामामूर्ति, श्री विदिद्वि चौधरी और मूझ को पटना हवाई अड्डे पर रोक लिया गया था।

Mr. Speaker: I know all that. Do not go into it now.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह मामला विशेषाधिकार समिति के पास गया था। इस लिए मेरी प्रार्थना है कि अगर इस मामले को नियम 227 के मातहत, बिना बहस किए, केवल यह निश्चित करने के लिए कि क्या श्री गोपालन को गैर-कानूनी ढंग से दो घंटे तक रोका गया था, विशेषाधिकार समिति के पास भेजिये।

12.12 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE—
contd.

Mr. Speaker: Dr. Ram Subhag Singh.

NOTIFICATIONS UNDER INDIAN TELEGRAPH ACT

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (**Dr. Ram Subhag Singh**): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (5) of section 7 of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885:

- (1) The Indian Telegraph (Sixth Amendment) Rules, 1967 published in Notification No. GSR 1104 in Gazette of India dated the 17th July, 1967. [Placed in Library, see No. LT-1283/67].
- (2) The Indian Telegraph (Fifth Amendment) Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. GSR 1105 in Gazette of India dated the 18th July, 1967 [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1284/67].

12.12 hrs.

RE: QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—
contd.

Shri Vasudevza Nair (Peermade): May I make a submission?

Mr. Speaker: I have heard all of them. If you also want to say something, I will hear.