

ation the President of Costa Rica issued, on 23.1.1968, an amendment to earlier decree ordering that the Tejas should not leave Costa Rica until a decision was reached on the extradition proceedings which the Government of India was permitted to file. The Government of India preferred a formal request on 18.3.1968 to the Supreme Court for the extradition of Dr. and Mrs. Teja. On 29.3.1968, the Costa Rican Foreign Office forwarded this request to their Supreme Court for its advisory opinion.

It will thus be seen that there was no available delay on the part of the Government of India in instituting extradition proceedings against the Tejas in Costa Rica.

India's Exports

599. SHRI JUGAL MONDAL : Will the Minister of FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY be pleased to state :

(a) whether the export of Indian products to foreign countries has increased during 1969 ; and

(b) if so, the details thereof ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY (SHRI CHOWDHARY RAM SEWAK) : (a) Yes Sir.

(b) A statement showing major commodities, the exports of which have increased in January-April, 1969 compared to January-April, 1968, is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library See. No LT—1315/69*]

Re-Export of Indian Goods

600. SHRI VIRENDRA KUMAR SHAH : Will the Minister of FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY be pleased to state :

(a) whether there have been persistent reports to the effect that quite often goods are shipped by some Indian exporters to certain landlocked countries via ports like Amsterdam, Hamburg or Geneva and that they are re-exported to other countries from these ports ; and

* (b) if so, how it becomes possible for the exporters to route their goods through

those ports without any check from the Indian authorities ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY (SHRI CHOWDHARY RAM SEWAK) : (a) and (b) . Land-locked countries have necessarily to use third country ports both for their imports and exports. There have been sporadic reports of possible re-exports to third countries from such ports. Whenever such cases come to the notice of the Government, they are looked into and the matter taken up with the concerned Governments where necessary.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO US Q. NO. 2c80 RE. SONA SHOPS

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN TRADE AND SUPPLY (SHRI CHOWDHARY RAM SEWAK) : In the statement furnished in answer to part (a) of the Unstarred Question No. 2680 on the 12th March, 1969, the value of sales of the 'Sona' Shop in New York during the year 1967-68 may be read as Rs. 24.82 lakhs instead of Rs. 23.82 lakhs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

12.00 hrs.

Reported statement by Shri E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Chief Minister of Kerala and Shri A. K. Gopalan, M. P.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA (Hassan): I call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

The reported statement made by Shri E.M.S. Namboodiripad, Chief Minister of Kerala and Shri A. K. Gopalan, M. P. that the Communist Party (Marxist) would seek to destroy the Constitution from within and that their Governments in Kerala and West Bengal were to foment discontent among the masses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Shame, Shame.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : Sir, on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What is the point of order ?

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : Do you allow a point of order on a Calling Attention Notice ? *(interruptions)*

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : Please hear me first. I have Some objection ..*(interruption)*

श्री कुंवर लाल गुप्त : जब आपने एडमिट कर लिया तब फिर इनके बोलने का कोई सवाल नहीं है ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He had written to me that he wants to raise the point,

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : I do not know why these people are shouting like this. Please hear me.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH (Pali) : Sir, this Calling Attention has been admitted by you. So, it is challenging your right.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is only in regard to a question. So far as this Calling Attention is concerned, three hon. Members have written to me already that they want to raise points of orders and I thought that the point which they want to raise is a valid one. So, I have permitted them ..*(interruptions)*

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : Why don't they hear me first.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittor) : A point of order can arise only after the Minister has read out the statement. How can there be a point of order now ? It is a simple statement.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Three hon. Members have written to me about this particular Calling Attention Notice.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : They can write to you but you should not allow them to raise it here.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It is a very valid point. Further, it is for the Chair to decide it. Shri Ramamurti, Shri Madhu Limaye and Shri S. M. Banerjee have written to me. I am listening to Shri Ramamurti now.

SHRI RANGA : Of course, the Chair has the discretion to do it. But it will create a precedent. It has never happened before.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It has been permitted in the past on Calling Attention Notices.

SHRI RANGA : The ruling which you are giving and the procedure which you are following will create a bad precedent *(interruptions)*

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North East) : There is no question of creating any precedent. I have myself raised a point of order before the answer was given on a previous occasion ..*(interruptions)*

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : I want to make it quite clear that I have no objection to this question being discussed in this House. But when a member of this House is involved, it is but fair that what he has said must be before the House. We cannot go by the garbled version that has appeared in the newspapers ..*(interruptions)*. Here is Shri A. K. Gopalan who is a Member of this House. If the conduct of a Member is bad, it is necessary and proper that the entire House should discuss his conduct. I have no objection with regard to that. I do not want to take shelter under any parliamentary privileges or anything of that nature. If the conduct of a member is bad, it must be discussed and if it demands reprimanding then the House can reprimand him. All that I say is that Shri A. K. Gopalan being a Member of this House, he must be first asked to produce the full text of his statement. Let that statement be circulated to every hon. Member of this House.

If after that any Member in this House wants to take objection that he has transgressed the Constitutional provisions in this country, let them agitate; I have no objection. Therefore, justice demands, fairplay demands and the dignity of the House demands, particularly when a Member's conduct is being questioned, that he should be asked to place on the Table of the House the full text of that statement and on that basis let a discussion take place.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Has Shri Banerjee anything to add to it ?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : I draw your attention to rule 197.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The plea has been made that when we debate the statement made by an hon. Member of this House on the basis of some reports that have appeared in the press, when he is present here and is prepared to submit..... (Interruption)

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : I do not know whether he is prepared.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will ask him.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Balmampur) : Then why did you admit this calling-attention notice ?

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा भी निवेदन सुनिये। आपको याद होगा मैंने आपको एक पत्र लिखा था, रूल 377 के अन्तर्गत कि यह सदन के एक सदस्य का मामला है, इसको मैं सदन में उठाना चाहता हूँ। अगर आप उसके लिए इजाजत देते तो श्री गोपालन को भी सूचना दी जा सकती थी और वे भी तैयार होकर आ सकते थे। लेकिन आपने मेरी नोटिस को स्वीकार नहीं किया, आपने काल अटेंशन नोटिस स्वीकार कर ली। इसलिए अब जो भी परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है उसके लिए आप जिम्मेदार हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Professor Madhok knows it because he met me on the same question that after I received Shri Vajpayee's letter I told Professor Madhok that I was admitting it but I would give notice to Shri Gopalan about this. After questions are put he should be given an opportunity; or, before questions are answered he is allowed to place before the House, as a Member of the House, what exactly he has said. I have intimated to Shri Gopalan about Shri Vajpayee's letter. Professor Madhok agreed with me about that.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South-Delhi) : I will explain the position.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now the question is whether it would be proper when an hon. Member of this House is involved and does not want to take shelter but says that the full text of his statement be placed before the House..... (Interruption)

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : Why did he not do it before today ? Why did he not correct it ? He could have written to the Home Minister.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not think we should look at it from any other angle than from what procedure we should follow. Shri Ramamurti has made an appeal. If the hon. Member is prepared to give the full text of his speech..... (Interruption)

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : It is a written out statement.

SHRI N. DANDEKER (Jamnagar) : Sir, on what basis are calling-attention notices admitted ? They are admitted on the basis of what appears in the newspapers. It has never been said earlier that a full copy of the statement or the press report should be called for.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : But the hon. Member is present here..... (Interruption). Shri Kunte.

श्री मधु लिमये : (मुंगेर) इन्होंने लिख कर दिया है, और किमी को बोलने का अधिकार नहीं है। मा० बनर्जी बोल रहे हैं तो उसके वाद में बोलूंगा। यह क्या तरीका है ?

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : अभी स्थिति यह है कि एक पौइंट ऑफ़ आर्डर उठाया। पीजीशन यह होनी चाहिये, राज्य सभा में भी मंजूर हुआ वहाँ इस का जवाब दिया गया, अगर होम मिनिस्टर को कोई श्रुवहा है तो उन का फ़र्ज था कि गोपालन साहब को कानटेक्ट करके मालूम करते कि तथ्य क्या है। गोपालन साहब होम मिनिस्टर को लिखते कि जो स्टेटमेंट मेरा है वह गलत है। यहाँ सदन का यह काम नहीं है। इसी तरह का एक मवाला मैंने उठाया था जिसे माननीय संजीव रेड्डी ने मन्जूर किया था और उस पर जवाब दिया था। अगर होम मिनिस्टर साहब को कोई संशय होता या है तो वह पूछ सकते हैं। अगर इनको कुछ कहना हो तो होम मिनिस्टर को कह सकते हैं। यहाँ पर कुछ कहना या कहलाना ठीक नहीं होगा, और

खास तौर से जब आप ने ऐडमिट कर लिया तो यह ठीक नहीं होगा। जवाब देने दीजिये।

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : May I suggest a simple procedure? The Calling Attention Notice has been admitted. I take it that the Minister is aware of what the correct facts are and, therefore, he is making a statement accordingly. If thereafter there is any inaccuracy between what the Minister has said and what Mr. Gopalan has said, Mr. Gopalan can be given an opportunity to make a personal explanation *(Interruptions)*

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon) : These people made an hon. Minister to go on a second honeymoon and then they apologised later. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PILOO MODY : He was responsible to send the Minister on a second honeymoon. I do not accept such a wild allegation. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Piloo Mody, I have not called you; without being called, you get up and speak.

SHRI PILOO MODY : I suggest a very simple procedure. Why don't you listen to me?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have called Mr. Kunte. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PILOO MODY : I have a right to speak on the point of order raised by Mr. Ramamurti.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When I permit you, you get up, not now.

SHRI PILOO MODY : All right; I will wait for it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Whether further discussion is necessary or not will be determined by the Chair. Just now, Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta suggested that it was for the Home Minister to ascertain the facts. If he has made an attempt to get an original speech.....*(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Otherwise, he can ask for time and he can get the full text. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S.M. BANERJEE : This statement cannot be made. Kindly hear me.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Unless I dispose of the point of order raised by Mr. Ramamurti, I am not going to call you.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : This is very unfair. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI KARTIK ORAON (Lohardaga) : On a point of order, Sir. *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Not at this stage. Please resume your seat. I wanted to get some assistance and, therefore, called Mr. Kunte. This is on a point of procedure. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (Kasergod) : There was a discussion in the Rajya Sabha.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It will be discussed here.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN : I have got the reports of speeches. I have got cyclo-styled copies—the published copy and the other copies of the statement...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is why I admitted the point of order.

I called Mr. Kunte to have his assistance on a specific point of procedure. I permitted Mr. Ramamurti to raise it because the name of an hon. Member of this House is involved. We do not have the definite, ascertained speech before us. There are only two ways. I must give him a hearing...*(Interruptions)*

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : तो श्री कुन्टे को क्यों आप बुला रहे हैं ?

श्री मधु लिमये : पॉइंट ऑफ़ ऑर्डर के लिये हम ने लिख कर दिया। यद्यपि लिखने की जरूरत नहीं थी।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Limaye cannot dictate to me. I will not listen in the midst. I am trying to dispose of a very valid point raised by Mr. Ramamurti.

Till I dispose that of, I will not listen.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप मेरी एक बात सुनिये । अगर अभी नहीं तो बाद में सुनेंगे ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Fresh ; not on this.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The limited question that has arisen is this. When I admitted the call-attention, I gave intimation to Mr. Gopalan immediately. The question is whether he should be permitted to give the authentic copy of his speech to the House and the Home Minister before we take up this issue. That is the only limited question.

SHRI DATTATRAYA KUNTE (Kolaba): The point raised by Mr. Ramamurti is positively valid for different reasons. The unfortunate practice in this House has been that call-attention notice and other notices are admitted on the basis of newspaper reports without going into the correctness or otherwise of the statements. A motion like this having been admitted, the House has now landed itself into difficulties. This has not happened only in the case of Mr. Gopalan. It happened in the case of other members also. I was also personally concerned with one. Before admitting call-attention notices, the office ought to be very careful. If newspaper reports are to be the basis on which call-attention notices are admitted, then the situation in which we have landed ourselves today will arise. The moment you got the intimation from Mr. Ramamurti, I would submit, you should have called the hon. Member and told him that this is the position that has arisen and, therefore, though the call-attention has been admitted, it would not be put in the agenda. The office should be more careful, so that the House does not land itself into such a trouble.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA) : If you would kindly see the calling-attention-notice as admitted by you, most of the confusion that is being created will be cleared. The calling-attention-notice that you have been pleased to admit reads as follows :

"...to call the attention of the Minister of Home Affairs to the reported statement..."

So, it is not an authentic statement but the reported statement, that is, as reported in the newspapers. The attention of Government is being called to the reported statement. So far as Government are concerned, Government have not seen any denial of that statement so far.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN : I have denied it. The hon. Minister may not have seen it. But I have denied it at a press conference. I have got the paper-cuttings here with me. On the 11th there was a press conference where I had denied it.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : Since you have admitted the notice, we have come forward with whatever information we have. This is the situation as I understand it. Therefore, you have to take a decision on the point of order raised by Shri P. Ramamurti on this basis, whether it is a reported statement or not and whether it has been denied by the Member or not. After considering these matters only you can give a ruling on this matter.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : When Shri P. Ramamurti approached me, I ascertained this. He has published a contradiction. Whether certain papers have published it or not, I have seen the contradiction, and he has published the contradiction.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR (Peermade): The hon. Minister was sleeping.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He has published a contradiction which I have seen.

SHRI E. K. NAYANAR (Palghat) : Why did you admit the calling-attention notice ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : As I have said, the reported statement is the basis of the calling-attention-notice. The hon. Minister has rightly pointed that out. When it was pointed out to the Member concerned; he being a Member of the House, he said that it was a published thing. In such a situation.....

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : It is a matter for you to decide. I have nothing

to say on that. Since you have admitted the calling-attention-notice, as to whether you want a statement by Government on the reported statement or not, it is for you to decide, and I have nothing to say on that.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : I want to know how this Government is functioning. Here is a Home Minister, and here is the Home Ministry which does not know that a full text of the speech has been published in *Deshabhimani* on the very next day. The Home Minister knows that our statements are not published in full always. They know that we have got an official organ and that paper carried the full text of the statement the very next day. How does this Government and the Home Ministry function when they cannot go into the full text of the statement ?

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH : A number of calling-attention-notice have been admitted and also answered here on a number of occasions on the basis of reported statements. They are tabled and admitted on the basis of reported statements always. So, what is the new situation that you are allowing to be created now ?

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak) : It is a question which has far-reaching consequences. It involves the fundamental rights of an hon. Member. He has a right to defend himself. How can you presume that the accusations are correct ? Here is a question which is pregnant with fundamental consequences which relates to the fundamental rights of a Member. If you concede that a Member has some fundamental rights as a Member of this Parliament, then if some allegations appear against him in the press, he has a right to controvert those allegations. How can you condemn a man without hearing him ? He has a right to be heard. Here is the Member and he has got to be heard. You cannot presume on the basis of newspaper reports that the allegations are correct. It is an unfortunate thing that you have admitted the calling-attention-notice. You have to avoid this kind of situation. What I feel is this. In a case like this, now that you have admitted the calling-attention-notice, the Member concerned, namely Shri A.K. Gopalan should

have the right of personal explanation, You may hear him before or after. It is up to you to decide the stage at which you are going to give to him that right of personal explanation.

The matter has come up before you. We presume that the matter may be true or may be wrong. Government may accept the version of the hon. Member Shri A. K. Gopalan himself. You may now allow the hon. Member to put the question to Government and immediately after that, you may allow Shri A. K. Gopalan to give his personal explanation. Shri A. K. Gopalan must be heard. I feel that the case cannot be allowed to go by default. That is my point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There are two ways. One is that the Home Minister may get the authentic copy, and then we can have a debate or discussion on it. Or Shri A. K. Gopalan can give his personal explanation. The honour of a Member is involved, and he is present here. In such a situation to put a question and expect an answer without first giving an opportunity to the Member to say what he wants is not fair. May I suggest to the House that let the Home Minister get the authentic copy of the statement, and we shall hold this over and we take it up tomorrow ?

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE (SHRI SWARAN SINGH) : It is entirely for the Chair to decide. You in your wisdom were wise to admit the calling-attention-notice on the basis of press reports. We on our side have always been pressing that it will be a good practice if calling-attention-notice are not admitted on the basis of press reports. That has consistently been the attitude of Government. Unless the facts are ascertained, the calling-attention-notice should be avoided, and if that is done, that will be a good thing. But because you have admitted the calling-attention-notice on the basis of press reports, we are prepared to answer it, in accordance with the notice that you have been pleased to admit. It is for you, Sir, to decide either way. So far as we are concerned, we accept your decision.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The limited question is whether Shri A. K. Gopalan

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

should be given the opportunity first or later.

AN HON. MEMBER : He may explain first.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am giving my ruling on it. This question has arisen because of the calling-attention-notice on the reported statement. The hon. Member is here. So, I would suggest that his statement may be circulated and then this notice may be taken up. Or, he may lay it on the Table of the House, and I shall permit him to do so. He may lay it on the Table of the House, and we shall hold this over for tomorrow.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Since you have referred to me, I may say that when we had talks, Shri A. K. Gopalan was there. Shri A. K. Gopalan said that he wanted to make a statement or he wanted to make a speech. He has a right to do it. But now that you have admitted this calling-attention-notice, what I would suggest is this. Similar cases have arisen in the past also. Your predecessor also had admitted similar notices in the past when similar points of order were raised. And he had said that once he had admitted the notice, the House would have to take it up, and after that, the Member concerned would have the right ; we admit that right, and he has a right to give his personal explanation. But when a thing has come upon the agenda, to hold it over would not be fair to the House or to those who have tabled it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Bal Raj Madhok will admit that even now we are following only the past practice. Leave aside the partisan statement here. When a Member is involved and he is prepared to clear everything and he has an opportunity to put questions, should he not be given an opportunity to place the facts before the House ? Should we have to go on the basis of imagined reports or half-truth reports ?

Now, let Shri A. K. Gopalan place it on the Table of the House, the original speech which he had made.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN : I place it on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See No. LT-1329/69.*]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, I am going to the next item.

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU : I am not questioning your ruling. But I want to know from you for future guidance one thing. So far we have been giving notices calling attention on certain matters based on press reports. Hereafter if you want certified copies of such statements from the persons concerned before we table call attention notices, is it possible to do it ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The Member is here.

SHRI M. N. REDDY (Nizamabad) : What about the call attention notice in so far as it relates to Shri E. M. S. Namboodiripad ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This will be taken up tomorrow.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA : No, just now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : On the calling-attention-notice, no more questions now. I am going over to the next item.

I have to inform the House that we have received a communication from Dr. N. Sanjiva Reddy which I would like to read out...

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (वलरामपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे एक निवेदन करना है काल अटेंशन के बारे में। श्री गोपालन का कहना यह है कि उन्होंने मलयालम में अपना वक्तव्य दिया था। मुझे पता नहीं कि वह टेबल पर मलयालम में रख रहे हैं या अंग्रेजी में। अगर वह टेबल पर मलयालम में रख रहे हैं तो आप उसका अपनी तरफ से मलयालम से अंग्रेजी में अनुवाद करवा दें।

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN : No, English translation of the statement.

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी (भोपाल) : श्री गोपालन का स्टेटमेंट जो मलयालम का पेपर 'देशाभिमानि' है, उस में छपा है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The English translation should be verified and then circulated.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA : Kindly give me an opportunity to make a submission just now.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Tomorrow.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA : In so far as your ruling relates to Shri A. K. Gopalan, who is a respectable member of the House, irrespective of the party to which he belongs, I accept it. But so far as Shri Namboodiripad is concerned, as his statement touches on a sacred constitutional aspect, and as he owes allegiance to another country, discussion on it can proceed right now. I would like to ask questions on that. So far as Shri A. K. Gopalan is concerned, it is a separate matter for the time being.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have given my ruling on the point.

SHRI RANGA : Does the paper which is laid on the Table contain the speeches of Shri Gopalan and Shri Namboodiripad ?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI : It is a joint statement.

SHRI RANGA : So far as Shri Namboodiripad's statement is concerned, we cannot be expected to accept it because he is not a member and it is not certified by himself.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Only Shri Gopalan's statement.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN : It is not a speech. It is a copy of a joint statement by me and Shri Namboodiripad at a press conference of the 7th July. This is a cyclostyled copy of that statement.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It has already been published in Malayalam.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA : There is no respect for the rules of procedure of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : It will not be fair to doubt the veracity of an hon. Member's statement.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN (Basti) : You are creating new precedents. The call-attention motion is against Shri Namboodiripad-cum-Gopalan, not only against one. It was your decision to admit it. Now you are yourself going against it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have already given my ruling. It can be taken

up only tomorrow.....(Interruptions) On that issue the matter is closed.

SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI (Bilhaur) : It is not a question of Mr. Gopalan or any other Member of the House...(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You seem to have some grave doubts. If I permit you, I shall have to permit several others. If the House wishes we can have a short duration discussion. I do not mind it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Because some Members are not satisfied, I shall allow a discussion if somebody demands it.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : जब मैंने चर्चा मांगी थी तब आप ने चर्चा नहीं दी और काल अटेशन ऐडमिट कर लिया, अब जब काल अटेशन आ गया है तब आप कहते हैं कि आप चर्चा देने के लिये तैयार हैं।

LETTER OF THANKS FROM DR.
N. SANJIVA REDDY, EX-SPEAKER,
LOK SABHA

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have a communication from Dr. N. Sanjiva Reddy addressed to the Lok Sabha Secretary :

"Thank you for sending me a copy of the motion adopted unanimously by the Lok Sabha appreciating the work done by me as Speaker. I am really grateful to the Leader of the House and the hon. Members belonging to all sections of the House. But for the hearty co-operation given by all of them it would not have been possible for me to discharge my duties as Speaker. I convey my grateful thanks to all the Members for their co-operation they have given me during my term of office as Speaker and for adopting the motion unanimously."

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप मेरा एक निवेदन तो सुन लें।