

अब उन्हें बुलाया जा रहा है। तो मैं आप से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या गवर्नर को आप यह सलाह देंगे कि जो मंत्रिमंडल के द्वारा भाषण तैयार कर के दिया जायेगा उस को वह ह्रुबहू विधान मंडल के सामने कहें, या अगर आप इस संघर्ष और टकराव को टालना चाहते हैं तो क्या आप उन्हें यह सलाह देंगे कि वह छूट्टी पा जायें। जब तक वह छूट्टी पर हैं एक आफिशिएटिंग गवर्नर वहां पर नियुक्त कर दिया जाये। केन्द्र और राज्यों के सम्बन्धों में काफ़ी कटुता आई है। मैं आज चेतावनी के रूप में कहना चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार इस को प्रतिष्ठा और इज्जत का सवाल न बनायें। पश्चिमी बंगाल की जनता का जो फैसला वॉइकट है उस के सामने आप भुंकिये और गवर्नर को यह सलाह दीजिये कि वह बीमारी को लेकर या और किन्हीं व्यक्तिगत कारणों को लेकर छूट्टी पर जायें और एक आफिशिएटिंग गवर्नर आये। जो पश्चिमी बंगाल का मंत्रिमंडल है वह उस को नीति वक्तव्य बना कर दे देगा और वह उस को पढ़ेगा।

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : He is asking me to give my opinion on constitutional issues. If he accepts me as a constitutional pundit, certainly, I will give him my opinion. But not here. Secondly, he is expecting me to give some advice to the Governor. The Government of India does not function as an adviser to the Governor.

श्री मधु लिमये : यह बिलकुल गलत बात कह रहे हैं क्योंकि यह हर कदम पर गवर्नर को ऐडवाइस निर्देश देते रहते हैं।

श्री बेबेन सेन (भासनसोल) : पश्चिमी बंगाल की जनता ने पिछले चुनावों के दौरान श्री धर्मवीर के खिलाफ़ अपनी राय का इजहार किया है या नहीं, अगर किया हो तो आम जनता की मांग के खिलाफ़ गवर्नर को सिर्फ़ संविधान के बहाने पर लादे रखना क्या उचित है ?

हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ने यहां पर कहा था कि मैं चाहती हूँ कि पश्चिमी बंगाल की सरकार वहां पर ठीक तरह शासन करे और हम उसे अपना सहयोग देंगे, यदि यह बात सच हो तो जो रास्ता यह गवर्नर को रिकॉल करने में देर करने के बारे में अपनाया जा रहा है वह क्या केन्द्र द्वारा पश्चिमी बंगाल की सरकार से सहयोग करने का रास्ता है ?

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN : If I have understood the significance of the mid-term election, they have given the mandate to the United Front Government to govern West Bengal constitutionally.

12.56. hrs.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Mahida wanted to say something.

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA (Anand) : My motion is about breach of privilege. I had written a letter under rule 222...

MR. SPEAKER : Is he speaking about that letter ? I thought he wanted to say something else. I have not given him consent. Unless the speaker gives consent, it cannot be raised. I have not given him permission. He may read the rule.

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA : The second para of rule 225 reads as follows :—

“Provided that were the Speaker has refused his consent under rule 222 or is of opinion that the matter proposed to be discussed is not in order, he may, if he thinks it necessary; read the notice of question of privilege and state that he refuses consent or holds that the notice of question of privilege is not in order.”

MR. SPEAKER : The rule says : ‘... he may, if he thinks it necessary’. I have not thought it necessary. I shall tell you. It is in your own interest that I have done so...

SHRI NAENRDRA SINGH MAHIDA : I wanted to raise...

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. The point is that some officer did not meet him when he went somewhere. If this is going to be a breach of privilege, I do not know what will happen. If the hon. Member thinks this way, it will be dangerous ; it is not desirable. I wanted to avoid the members knowing it. When he went on tour, some officer did not meet him. If this becomes a breach of privilege, it will be dangerous. Therefore, I have not allowed it. I have not thought it fit...*(Interruption)*. I am on my legs. I am not allowing you to raise it. I would have explained to you in my Chamber. I wanted to avoid this coming before the House. It is not proper...

SHRI NARENDRA SINGH MAHIDA : I wanted to raise, so that it can be taken notice of.

MR. SPEAKER : I have not allowed it. The rule is ; '.....he may, if he thinks it necessary...'. I have not thought it necessary.

Mr. Nambiar.

SHRI NAMBIAR (Tiruchirapalli) : I am raising a question of breach of privilege on the editorial that has appeared in the *Maharashtra Times*, a daily newspaper in Marathi, published from Bombay in its issue dated the 20th February, under the caption, 'BHUTA HATE BHAGWAT' meaning 'Bhagawat in the Bhut's Hand'...*(Interruption)* I shall give the English translation of that. The English translation is : 'A Ghost with a Bible on hand'. This is about the speech made by my hon. friend, Shri P. Ramamurti, here on a debate on 18th February. It starts like this.

13 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER : The whole editorial need not be read out.

SHRI NAMBIAR : I shall read out only the relevant portions. It says :

"It is inevitable that the echo of the Bombay riots should be heard in Parliament".

From the way it is written, it is clear that it is about the speech made by Shri P. Ramamurti here.

My objections come under two headings. One is that it is a gross misrepresentation of his speech and also that it

is a reflection on the Member. A reflection on the Member is a reflection on the House. In May's Parliamentary Practice you will find these two portions...

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : May I make one submission ? Unless we have a copy of the editorial, how can we give permission ?

SHRI NAMBIAR : I am explaining it. The editorial comes under two heads. One is that it is a reflection on the House.

MR. SPEAKER : It is nearing 1 p. m. and it is time for lunch. Before I proceed further, I would like to say that wherever I am myself convinced that a privilege issue is involved, I automatically send it to the Committee, but where I am in doubt, I do not take the decision, but I leave it to the House. Normally where it is very clearly known that a breach of privilege may be there, I automatically refer it. But since I was in doubt I allowed Shri Nambiar to seek the permission of the House so the House could see whether there is a privilege issue or not. Naturally, the pertinent question raised by hon. Members is how they are to know what the contents of the editorial are, because it has not been circulated to them. But I think the hon. Member would explain the relevant points. If we except him to circulate the editorial and all the other papers, I do not think that it would be possible for a Member to do so, and circulate it to all the 525 Members.

So, when we re-assemble after lunch at 2 p. m., he may explain in three or four minutes the relevant portions which might be abusive in nature. There might be abusive language, but whether a privilege issue is involved, whether it is unparliamentary etc., it is for this House to judge and not for me. Therefore, I leave it to the House. I have not given my decision because I had some doubt, and, therefore, I have given him permission to raise it in the House by reading it out and convince the House that it is a matter of privilege. Of course, Shri Nambiar will continue at 2 p. m.