

**The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Sri Lal Bahadur Shastri):** (a) No.

(b) The land for the approach road has not yet been handed over to us by the Government of Kerala.

(c) The project, when sanctioned, is expected to be completed in about 3 years.

-----

12.04 hrs.

RE: QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received some notices about questions of privilege—I need not read all of them—some about the arrest of Dr. Lohia and others that some Members of the socialist group were beaten outside the Home Minister's House.

**Shri Kishen Pattanayak (Sambalpur):** Yes, I was there.

**Mr. Speaker:** I fail to understand how these can be questions of privilege. Something has happened there. I cannot take that up in Parliament as a question of privilege. I have disallowed them. There are two more things about which I have to inform the House.

-----

12.05 hrs.

RE. ASPERSIONS ON P.A.C. IN BHARAT JYOTI AND APOLOGY BY THE EDITOR

**Mr. Speaker:** I have to inform the House that my attention was drawn to an article under the heading "Service or Slander?" published in *The Bharat Jyoti*, Bombay, in its issue dated the 16th May, 1965, which allegedly contained aspersions on the Public Accounts Committee of Lok Sabha. The article stated *inter alia*:

"The Reports of the P.A.C. are becoming increasingly audit re-

ports, similar to those of the Auditor-General, rather than review reports; and are thus becoming increasingly superfluous where they are not positively mischievous in their impact and incidence."

The article had also used in relation to the Public Accounts Committee the phrases "absence of understanding of the underlying social objectives to public undertakings" and "the P.A.C. does not appear to understand that loans in most commercial transactions... are in fact continuously repaid and equally continuously renewed...".

2. Under my direction, a letter was addressed to the Editor of *The Bharat Jyoti*, Bombay, asking him to state what he had to say in the matter.

3. In his reply, the Editor has stated, *inter alia*:

"... It was not, therefore, meant even remotely to be disrespectful to the Parliamentary Committees.

I am sorry that any such impression should have been created as stated by you in your letter under reply. Let me assure you that the article could be interpreted in the manner stated by you had not even remotely occurred to me in publishing it.

I trust that this explanation will make the position clear and satisfy the Speaker that the purpose of this article was not, is not and never intended to cast aspersions or to show any disrespect to Parliamentary Committee.

Criticism of the Public Accounts Committee is made in good faith and in a constructive spirit and I hope it would be taken in the same spirits.

Needless to say that, if any disrespect to, or aspersions on, the Public Accounts Committee of the Lok Sabha is read into the article-