

DEFENCE OF INDIA (FIFTH AMENDMENT) RULES

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri L. N. Mishra): Sir, on behalf of Shri Hathi I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Defence of India (Fifth Amendment) Rules, 1965, published in Notification No. GSR 1584 in Gazette of India dated the 27th October, 1965, under section 41 of the Defence of India Act, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5163/65].

NOTIFICATION UNDER ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Shri D. R. Chavan): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. GSR 1635 published in Gazette of India dated the 5th November, 1965, under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-5164/65].

12.11 hrs.

RULING ON ALLEGATIONS MADE AGAINST A MINISTER

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members would recall that on the 2nd September 1965 Shri Prakash Vir Shastri, while speaking on the Aigarh Muslim University (Amendment) Bill 1965, made certain statements, which were denied and repudiated by Shri Humayun Kabir, Minister of Petroleum and Chemicals. The statements were presumably defamatory and cast reflections against the Minister. A demand was made in the House that:

"this should be made a test case. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri should prove his allegations and the Minister concerned should also place the facts before you

(the Speaker) and you should be pleased to take a decision."

Shri D. C. Sharma added that:

"I think the atmosphere of the Lok Sabha is spoiled by such bandying of words across the Table between an Opposition Member and a Minister. This should be put an end to for all time to come. This can be done only if you have this as a test case and come to an impartial and objective decision about it, so that nothing like this happens in future."

I had no inclination to pursue the matter any further or to enter into any investigation. I advised the House that:

"I feel that it would be going to the extreme if it is made a test case. We are sorry for this affair but perhaps it will not be desirable to inquire about it. The matter should be dropped here."

Unluckily, my advice was not accepted and both hon. Members insisted that I must go into the facts.

Shri Humayun Kabir went so far as to suggest that:

"whoever is proved to have made a false statement, he should lose his seat in this Parliament for the rest of the tenure."

I reacted that there could not be any pre-condition about the punishment, I will look into the facts and place my assessment before the House, which can then come to any conclusion that it deems fit and proper under the circumstances. I am sorry, there has been some delay. I was not keeping well and I could not attend to this question.

I asked the parties to send to me their statements and any proof that they might like to adduce. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri had alleged that