

श्री राम सेवक यादव : अगर आप चाहते हैं तो आपको खिलाफ अविश्वास प्रस्ताव भी लाया जा सकता है। श्री मधु लिमये ने आपको लिखकर दिया है। फिर आप उनको बुलाने से इन्कार कर रहे हैं। (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Yadav, I am again repeating, don't hold the House to ransom. (Interruptions)

श्री रवि राय : आप ऐसा कर रहे हैं। (व्यवधान)

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने आपको लिखा है। आपने कितने ही अन्य सदस्यों को बुलाया है। आप मुझे मौका देने से इन्कार क्यों कर रहे हैं? कल भी आपने मुझे पायंट आफ आर्डर नहीं उठाने दिया।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I was making a constructive suggestion... (Interruption).

श्री मधु लिमये : आप स्वयं नियमों के अनुसार नहीं चलते हैं और दूसरों को दोष देते हैं। जो लिख कर देते हैं, आप उन्हें भी नहीं बुलाते हैं।

श्री राम सेवक यादव : जैसे बैल के सामने काला कपड़ा होता है, संसोपा आपके सामने वैसे ही है। मैं आपका व्यवहार देख रहा हूँ। जैसे बैल काला कपड़ा देखकर भड़क उठता है, वैसे ही आप भी संसोपा से भड़कते हैं। (व्यवधान)

SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI (Bhubaneswar) : Mr. Yadav is becoming intolerable in this House. (Interruptions).

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : This is very bad. यह इस हाउस की तौहीन है। इस तरह चौबीसों घंटे गर्म रहना मुनासिब नहीं है।

श्री रवि राय : हम लोग आप से कम रहते हैं।

12.38 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE  
APOLOGY BY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF OF THE  
HINDUSTAN TIMES

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : On the 28th July, 1969, Shri T. Viswanatham raised a question of privilege regarding reflections cast on the Deputy-Speaker in the article under the caption "The Week in Parliament" published in the *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi dated the 27th July, 1969. As decided by the House, the Editor of the newspaper was asked, in the first instance, to state what he had to say in the matter.

I have now received a letter dated the 31st July, 1969 from the Editor-in-Chief, *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, which reads as follows :—

"Shri Sen (the concerned correspondent) relied on a summary of the speech made by Shri M.R. Masani on the Banking Companies Nationalisation Bill on July 25 and issued to the press for favour of publication that same evening by the Swatantra Party Parliamentary Office under the signature of Shri A.P. Jain. A copy of this is appended. It is in the summary that the particular reference appears to which objection has been taken. As soon as the matter was raised in the Lok Sabha, we ourselves went through the official record and we have subsequently received a copy of the same with your letter. The official record does not contain the words and phrases that Mr. Sen drew upon from the unofficial summary and on which he relied in good faith. It was not Mr. Sen's intention in writing his Review, nor ours, in publishing it, to distort the proceedings of the House or to impute any motives to the Honourable Deputy-Speaker in any manner whatsoever."

"In the circumstances we deeply regret that we should have unwittingly published something that is at variance with the official record and which casts any reflection on the Chair."

"I would request you kindly to convey this explanation to the Honourable

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Deputy-Speaker together with an unconditional apology for the commission of a completely unintended offence."

In view of the explanation and the unconditional apology tendered by the Editor-in-Chief of the newspaper, if the House agrees, the Editor may be asked to publish his explanation and the apology on the front page of the next issue of the newspaper and thereafter the matter may be treated as closed.

This is the practice that we follow. I take it that the House agrees.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): The House may agree. But I would like to say that the newspaper has taken it from the hand-out circulated by the Swatantra Party which does not seem to contain the official proceedings. It is, therefore, a breach of privilege on the part of the Swatantra Party.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will place this on the Table—the official summary which it contains. If it constitutes a breach of privilege, then it will be referred to the Privileges Committee or brought before the House. (Interruption) So far as the newspaper is concerned, with the concurrence of the House, the matter is closed. But if somebody raises the matter that an agency of any Party has circulated unauthorisedly certain communication casting as persons, then I cannot shield.

SHRI S. K. TAPURIAH: —Rose

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not taking any decision. I am just placing it on the Table of the House. This matter is closed. About the suggestion of Mr. Banerjee, we shall examine it.

12.43 hrs.

RE. SUIT AGAINST FORMER SPEAKER AND OTHER MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT IN DELHI HIGH COURT

श्री मधु लिये (मुंगेर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आप से एक जानकारी चाहता हूँ। मैंने आप को लिखा भी है। 4 संसद सदस्यों के

खिलाफ जिन में भूतपूर्व स्पीकर भी हैं हाई कोर्ट में मामला चला या तो उस दिन मामला यहां उठाया गया था और नियम के अनुसार मेरी और कई सदस्यों की राय थी कि इस पर अनुमति मांगने की इजाजत दे कर बहस करवानी चाहिए। खैर, उस दिन आपने जो किया वह ठीक किया या नहीं, उसको भी छोड़ देता हूँ। लेकिन अब हमको पता चला है कि यह केस खारिज करने के बजाय दिल्ली हाई कोर्ट के जज ने चीफ जस्टिस को पत्र लिखा है कि यह मामला बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है इसलिए और बड़ा बेंच बनाया जाय। तो मामला और गहराई में चला जा रहा है। इसलिए आप की मैं अनुमति चाहता हूँ कि आप इस मामले को जो नई जानकारी मिली है उस की रोशनी में बाकायदा नियम के अनुसार उठाने की इजाजत दीजिए। यदि आप आज नहीं देना चाहते तो सोमवार को रखिए।

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): I am one of those who are concerned with this. This has appeared in today's *Times of India*:

"DISPOSAL AT EARLY DATE OF SUIT AGAINST REDDY URGED"

"An application by the Union of India seeking early disposal of the libel suit against the former Speaker of the Lok Sabha, Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, and four members of Parliament at an early date was heard by the Delhi High Court today."

"Moving the application, Mr. Deepak Dutt Chowdhari, counsel for the Union of India, submitted that the Government was anxious for early disposal in view of the Presidential election on August 16 in which the former Speaker was also a candidate of the ruling Congress Party..."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have read it.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Only one minute. It is also said:

"The request of the Union of India was