श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : सब को आप ने सुना है। मेरा श्री व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है और मुझे आज्ञा ही नहीं दे रहे हैं।

श्री बड़े : उन से आप पूछ तो लें कि क्या कहना चाहते हैं ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मेरे पास आ जायें और मुझे समझा दें। उनको कहें कि बैठ जायें।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आप सुन लें और मैं बैठ जाता हूं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या स्पीकार को रेग्युलेट काम को करना है या हर एक मैम्बर को करना है। हर एक मैम्बर जो कुछ भी वह कहना चाहता है उस को सुनने के लिए मैं तैयार नहीं होता हूं तो मुझे डांट दी जाती है और कहा जाता है कि मैंने उसको बुलाया नहीं है। अगर मैं कहता हूं कि कालिंग एटेंशन को मैंने नामंजूर कर दिया है तो कहा जाता है कि कैसे कर दिया है। मेरे पास तीस तीस नोटिस आते हैं और हर एक मैम्बर को यह कैसे बता सकता हूं कि उसके नोटिस में यह यह लिखा हुआ था ; यह कैसे हो सकता है। मेरी शक्ति के तो यह बाहर की चीज है।

श्री बड़े : आप के सामने आए बगैर ही नामंजूर हो जाते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बिल्कुल नहीं। सारे मेरे नोटिस में आते हैं।

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha): May I, Sir, very humbly tell the hon. Members of the Opposition. through you, that the Parliament is not going to end today. We have some important business and the Minister is making a statement. I would very humbly request them to allow him and all these questions may be taken up tomorrow.

12.40 hrs.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER *RE*: QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Cooperation (Shri C. Subramaniam): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the 17th May, 1966, there were certain questions in the Lok Sabha arising from the 50th Report of the Public Accounts Committee. I was not present at the time these questions were answered by my colleague, the Minister of Iron and Steel. I had been under the impression that this report primarily dealt with certain transactions relating to imports and exports in the period during which Shri Bhoothalingam was Secretary. I had taken over as Minister of Steel and Heavy Industries in April, 1962 at which time my Secretary was Shri N. N. Wanchoo. In the afternoon of 17th May, 1966, when I was in the Lok Sabha, I found certain questions being raised as to the Minister who had been mentioned in the Public Accounts Committee report. Under the mistaken impression that the matter dealt with in the House was certain transactions relating to imports during the period prior to my assumption of office, I had denied that I was the Minister concerned. It was only later that it was brought to my notice that P.A.C. had commented on certain penal orders I had passed on Amin Chand Pyare Lal and associated concerned. It was this confusion which had led to my denial on 17th May, 1966, that I was the Minister concerned. I am sorry I had misunderstood the trend of discussion in the House. I had expressed regrets to the House even on the 18th May, 1966 and I wish to reiterate the same.

The transactions about which the 50th Report of the P.A.C. has commented in regard to my term of office took place nearly three years ago. When I made my statement of personal explanation on the 18th May, 1966, I had scarcely 12 hours in which I had to go through all the papers and

[Shri C. Subramaniam]

prepare a statement for Parliament. At this distance of time, it is only on the basis of the recollections that one is able to bridge the gaps in the notings in the file. It is in this context I would like you, Sir, and the House, to view any errors that might have crept into the statement. I can only say that they were not in the least intended to mislead the House in any way.

Breach of privilege has been alleged in respect of my use of the words "draft form". In my statement, I had stated "actually when my orders dated 28-6-1963, that the suspension should affect all departments of Governments, were communicated to the Iron and Steel Controller in a draft form the question was raised whether the order should be a blanket one covering both trading concerns and production and other non-trading units". I would like to mention that I had not stated nor intended to state that my decision was not a final one. The question about eliminating non-trading concerns was raised in a letter from the Deputy Iron and Steel Controller enclosing a draft suspension order. My decision had to be translated into a formal order and implemented by the Iron and Steel Controller. In putting up this letter the office noted as follows:

"In compliance with the Minister's orders, the Steel Control have sent a draft of the suspension order."

It was this noting that led to the erroneous drafting of my statement that my order itself was communicated in a draft form. I am sorry due to faulty wording my statement of the 18th May had given the impression that my order was a draft one. I have specifically mentioned this wording as a mistake to the P.A.C. also.

I had brought out the fact that Jit Paul of the Aminchand Pyarelal Group met me and had made certain representations before me. I had reproduced extracts from his letter in my statement of 18th May, 1966 which forms part of the record. At the first opportunity I brought this to the attention of the House and the P.A.C. It cannot be urged that this fact had been suppressed by me at any time.

It has also been stated that my use of the word 'surprising' implies contempt of the P.A.C. I had used the word, in the sense that I was 'taken unawares'. If, however, it is felt that to say that I am surprised by an observation of the Public Accounts Committee is a reflection on the Committee, I am prepared to unconditionally withdraw the same. It was not my intention to cast any reflection on the P.A.C. I had categorically expressed this in my evidence before the P.A.C.

The observation that had been made by the Public Accounts Committee in their 50th Report which gave rise to my statement of 18th May, 1966 was "The sub-committee are unable to understand the circumstances under which the Minister changed his previous orders so soon that the business suspension with M/s. Aminchand Pyarelal Group of firms should not be communicated to other Government Departments." As the P.A.C. has stated in its 55th Report, this was based in particular on the evidence tendered by the Secretary, Ministry of Iron and Steel, as summarised in paras 4.126 and 4:127 of their 50th Report and in particular, the reply given by the Secretary below:

"Q. Why Minister changed his mind that it should not be communicated to other departments?

A. I cannot answer what made the Minister to do so."

It is this evidence which had presumably led to the Public Accounts Committee's remarks in para 4:128 of their 50th Report. It was my feeling that two important aspects had not been brought to the notice of the Public Accounts Committee. One aspect was the view of the Transport

Ministry as summarised in the note of the Deputy Secretary given below:

"Secretary may kindly see the letter of Controller regarding proposed issue of suspension order against Aminchand Pyarelal Group. Controller has now raised the question of exclusion of M/s. Apeejay Lines which is a shipping concern. In this connection, I had a word with Dr. Nagendra Singh, Additional Secretary, Ministry of T. & C. He said that so far as the Shipping Co. was concerned, his Ministry had no reason for complaint. In fact this Company had come to the rescue of the Government of India in lifting the Burma rice when other companies had refused. He, therefore, felt that as the irregularity was committed by the firm in connection with the iron and steel distribution, it would not be desirable to include the shipping line in the proposed order. The name of M/s. Apeejay Lines may, therefore, be deleted from the order, draft of which is at pages 130/131 corr."

(Action under para 5 of the code will be taken after the issue of the order of the I. & S. C.)

Sd. M. C. MISHRA,
22-7-63.
Deputy Secretary.

The other aspect was that my meeting with the representative of the firm and his letter expressing unqualified apology for any past misconduct and assuring future good behaviour which had been part of the record on the file had also not been brought to the notice of the P.A.C. As I felt that these two aspects had an important bearing on my decision, I wished to place them before the P.A.C. and explain the circumstances under which I exercised my Ministerial discretion to amend my first order so as to restrict the scope to the concerns dealing with the Iron and Steel trade and therefore to the Iron and Steel Controller.

It has been urged that my appearance before the P.A.C. itself was a breach of privilege. I have nothing to add to what the Chairman of the P.A.C. has already mentioned in this regard. It was not my intention at any point to pressurise any committee of Parliament, let alone the P.A.C. Since certain observations had been made relating to me and since it was my feeling that evidence of the officials was not complete in the earlier instance, I thouht it would be only fair to the committee and to myself if I could meet them.

I may assure the House that when I appeared before the Committee it was with the specific intention of assisting the Committee. I did not know that the Committee had finalised its recommendations and I have said so to the P.A.C. I thought it would be better if I requested the Chairman, P.A.C. for a chance to appear. I thought that if there was anything irregular in my request, the Chairman of the P.A.C. would refuse it.

From what I have stated it should be clear that I had never intended to mislead the House or the P.A.C. and if anything, I had endeavoured to offer the fullest possible statement of facts within my knowledge and recollection at every stage. I want to assure, you, Sir, and through you, this Hon'ble House that I will be the last person to attempt or intend, either directly or indirectly, a breach of the privilege of this House, of which I have the honour and privilege of being an integral part as a Member. If there is anything I might have said which is likely to create, even remotely, any such impression, I would like to express my regret.

Some hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Shri Madhu Limaye has started the case. I will give him five minutes to say whatever he might have to say.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे विनती करूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय का जो बयान है, इसको आज मुझे ठीक तरह से पढ़ने दीजिए। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि अभी भी उस में कुछ ग़लतियां हैं, लेकिन मैं जल्दबाज़ी में कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता हूं। अगर आप मुझ पर मेहरबान होंगे और मुझे समय देंगे, तो मैं कल इस बारे में निवेदन करूंगा। पांच मिनट मेरे लिए काफ़ी हैं।

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): I will request that this should be circulated to Members; it is better if copies of it are circulated. At the same time, I want to make another request. I had written to you to have access to the evidence tendered before the Public Accounts Committee. In his statement the Minister also has referred to the evidence. Therefore the evidence relating to the 50th and 55th Reports of the Committee should be allowed to be seen.

Mr. Speaker: About the statement, I will ask the Minister to place it in the Library. About the evidence, I suppose, the Chairman, Public Accounts Committee, has no objection to that.

Shri Morarka (Jhunjhunu): It all depends on your direction. Our convention is to place the minutes, which are fairly detailed and which contain all important points. So far as the verbatim record is concerned, it is generally not made available to anybody except under your direction. If you so direct, it will be made available to anybody whom you like.

श्री मधु लिमये : कम-से-कम हमको तो दिया जाये। प्रस्ताव मेरा है।

Mr. Speaker: When the minutes have been placed, why should Shri Dwivedy want the verbatim report?

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: You must agree that this is a very important matter. Minutes do not contain any details. The evidence will give the details and what are the questions and answers. In the evidence we may find something which may be helpful. So, it would be very much necessary.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): There used to be at a point of time, I remember distinctly, the practice that full details of the evidence offered before a Committee were available. For some reason or other that practice was discontinued. You can easily revive it.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Mukerjee would agree with me that it is desirable that the whole evidence should not be publicised, because, under these circumstances, the officials would be afraid to say openly what they want to say. If they feel that everything that they say is going to be published or known to everyone, then probably they might feel some difficulty. (*Interruption*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: If you bear with me, we did have access to the evidence at one point of time and heavens never fell. For some reasons, that access was taken away. Now, there is no reason why, in this particular case, when so many unsavoury things appear to be coming up—I am sorry to have to say that—when the whole country is talking about it, it is very necessary that the Members of Parliament are enabled to have some idea of the evidence. There is nothing to prevent us from getting access to the evidence which we used to have before.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the desire of the House that the Minister's evidence should be made known? (*Interruptions*)

Shri A. C. Guha (Barasat): In this case, many conventions of Parliamentary Committees, I think, have been contravened. It was not the convention to call any Minister before any Parliamentary Committee. That has been allowed. Now, if all the records and the evidence are made public, that

would be another violation of the convention followed so long; and that will create further handicaps for the proper functioning of the Parliamentary Committees, particularly, the Financial Committees. Many documents are given to us marked 'Confidential' and even 'Secret'. We take those things and the evidence on the assurance that the source will not be disclosed. We give the assurance that the information that we may get from any person will be utilised in formulating the opinion of the Committee and that the source will not be disclosed. Even the officials will hesitate then to speak frankly to the Committee. If, in this position, we allow the evidence and the record of the Committee to be made available in this manner, it will create a precedent which will be bad for the furture and which will affect the efficient functioning of the Parliamentary Committees, particularly, the Financial Committees.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): It will be very difficult to run the Parliamentary Committees.

Shri Bade (Khargone): Sir, this is a special case when a Minister is called before the Public Accounts Committee. There is no precendent at all like this. So, when it is a special case and there are so many things which are not known to the Members of Parliament—I think this will not be quoted as a precedent for the future—the evidence may be shown to the Members of Parliament. It may not be given to the press.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): This is a very important case. Sir, I was going through some of the records of the Central Assembly debates. My friend, Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, always tells us that in those days, they were under such restrictions. Now, I found that on a particular occasion even top secret and confidential documents, when the Leader of the House, Pandit Motilal Nehru, asked for them, the Speaker asked the Government and the Government showed them those records. Has it ever been done during the life time of these three Parliaments? It has never been done in the history of these three Parliaments that I have been here. Therefore, I say, on this particular occasion, if any Member wants to see any particular document, even if it is confidential, if it is for the purpose of this debate, you should ask the Government to show it to that particular Member of the House. Otherwise, there is no point.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

श्री बाबू लिम्बे : प्रिविलेज मोशन मेरा है, कम से कम मुझ को तो पूरी गवाही दी जाय । मैं अपना लिखित जवाब आपके सामने रखूंगा । अगर आप स्वीकार करेंगे ... (व्यवधान) ।

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): It will be a breach of faith.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Being a Member of the Public Accounts Committee, I feel that there is a great deal of force in it, that the evidence should not be made available and that it may create trouble. There is not doubt about it. But there is Rule 275 to which I would like to invite your attention. It says:

"(2) No part of the evidence, oral or written, report or proceedings of a Committee which has not been laid on the Table shall be open to inspection by anyone except under the authority of the Speaker.

(3) The evidence given before a Committee shall not be published by any member of the Committee or by any other person until it has been laid on the Table:

Provided that the Speaker may, in his discretion, direct that such

[Shri U. M. Trivedi]
evidence be confidentially made available to members before it is formally laid on the Table."

Now, this makes the hole position clear. It was rather unusual, it was a unique occasion, for a Minister to appear before the Public Accounts Committee. At least five times I have been a Member of the Public Accounts Committee and I have never come across a single occasion or had any occasion of knowing it that a Minister did appear before the Public Accounts Committee. Without criticising what is the Report, I personally, do feel that, if a point is to be discussed in the House, the evidence, in my opinion, would be necessary for those who want to speak on it. But, at the same time, there are other aspects of it and the other view is also not very wrong. Under the present circumstances, if some via media is found out, the fear of the officers who come before the Public Accounts Committee and give evidence unhampered....

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Why should they fear?

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Everybody does not want to tell the truth in open but still he wants to tell the truth in confidence. That happens. Generally, that confidence will be shaken. That aspect of the case is there. But, anyhow, under the present circumstances, if a matter is to be discussed, the evidence of Mr. Subramaniam may be made available or the extracts may be prepared under your direction and particular portion may be made available. That depends upon how the directions can be given under Rule 275.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: I am happy that Mr. Trivedi has spoken with certain hesitation and limitation. I maintain, to disclose the evidence tendered before these Parliamentary Committees would amount to a breach of faith. The representatives of the public organisations appear before the Committees not only officials—they may be very freely dealing with officials. But, as I see, the public organisations send their representatives and when they give evidence, the Chairman of the Committee assures them openly, definitely and very clearly, that whatever they say will be kept confidential. It is on the assurance of the Chairman, that the representatives of public organisations tender evidence before the Committees. If, as has been demanded now, the evidence is to be made open and known to everybody, I say, you may first make it a rule like that that it shall be made public and then it may be published. It cannot be done at this stage when persons have already given evidence on the assurance that that evidence will be terated as confidntial. It would amount to a breach of faith. That is my submission.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee whether an assurance had to be given to those who appear before the Public Accounts Committee that it will be kept secret.

Shri Morarka: The procedure in the Public Accounts Committee is slightly different than that of in the Estimates Committee in this behalf in the sense that the Public Accounts Committee mostly examines only the officers and that they do not examine public witnesses representing public institutions. It is not a normal procedure of our Committee to read out any assurance to the witnesses when they appear before the Committee.

Having said that, I must hasten to add that what the hon. Member, Shri Guha, has said that the freedom with which the officers speak will certainly be affected if it becomes a normal procedure that the verbatim record of all those proceedings are laid on the Table of the House or are made available to the Members of Parliament because—whatever we may say, we can ask them to speak the truth—they may speak the truth but still they may not give the full facts. I think, the ruling which was given

previosuly that the verbatim records should not be placed on the Table of the House has a lot of force in it.

श्री मौर्य (अलीगढ़) : श्रीमन्, पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी में एक साल से ज्यादा से मैं काम कर रहा हूं । थोड़ा बहुत जो वह सीखा है, उसके आधार पर मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि मई में जब यह प्रश्न उठा था तो सदन में यह फैसला लिया गया कि पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी को रिपोर्ट को वापस फिर कमेटी को रिकन्सीडर करने के लिये भेजा जाय । उस समय भी एतराज उठा था कि यहां पर परम्परा को तोड़ा जा रहा है, इस तरह की परम्परा नहीं है। दूसरे इस सदन को यह अधिकार भी नहीं जाता था, क्योंकि पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी में दोनों ही सदनों के सदस्य हैं, पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी में राज्य सभा के भी सदस्य हैं और लोक सभा के भी सदस्य हैं, दोनों ही सदन मिल कर परम्परा को तोड़ सकते थे, लेकिन फिर भी परम्परा टूटी ।

13 hrs.

मैं, श्रीमन्, इस सभय परम्परा की ही बात को ले रहा हूं, क्योंकि यहां पर इस समय परम्परा की ही बातें कही गई हैं । दो एक अखबारों ने गलत बातें निकाली हैं । पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने मंत्री महोदय को नहीं बुलाया, बल्कि मंत्री महोदय स्वयं पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी के सामने गये । मंत्री महोदय को मालूम था कि पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी की दोबारा रिपोर्ट इसी वजह से जा रही है कि वे कुछ सफ़ाई पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी को देना चाहते थे, बावजूद इस बात के कि पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने उन अफसरान को बुलाया था जिनसे उसका सम्बन्ध था, एक सब कमेटी का निर्माण हुआ और वह सब-कमेटी बैठी, यह बात सबको मालूम है । उसके बैठने के बावजूद मंत्री महोदय नहीं गये, एक परम्परा यह भी टूटी, दूसरी परम्परा यह टूटी कि जब सब-कमेटी और पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी अपनी रिपोर्ट पूरी कर चुकी थी उसके बाद फिर मिनिस्टर साहब को दोबारा मौका दिया गया यह भी परम्परा टूटी । अब चौथी परम्परा की ? श्रीमन् मैं बात करता हूं अभी जो बयान मंत्री महोदय का आया है सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब ने जो अपना बयान दिया है इसका सीधा सम्बन्ध उन तत्वों से जाता है जो उन्होंने अपनी गवाही या बयान पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी में दिया है । जब तक पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी के सामने इन्होंने प्रश्नों के जो उत्तर दिये हैं वे सदन के सामने न आ जायें तब तक यह साबित नहीं हो सकता कि इनका बयान सत्यता रखता है या उससे परे है । इसलिये आवश्यक हो जाता है कि जब चार परम्परायें टूटी हैं तो पांचवीं परम्परा भी टूटे जो गवाहियां वहां पर हुई हैं वे सदन के सामने आयें, सत्य असत्य क्या है यह मालूम हो सके ।

यहां पर सीक्रेट और कान्फीडेन्शल की बात भी कही गई है । मेरा अपना ख्याल है कि देश का यह सदन सर्वश्रेष्ठ है, इससे कोई भी चीज, कान्फीडेन्शल नहीं रखी जानी चाहिये । विशेषकर, जब कि मैं यह नहीं कहता कि मैं मंत्री महोदय पर कोई लांछन लगाता हूं, मैं हर एक को ईमानदार समझता हूं । परन्तु जब जरा भी शक आये तो उसमें पूरा पोस्ट-मार्टम होना चाहिये और वह तभी हो सकता है, जब यह सामने आये ।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जब आप पर थोड़ा सा अंकुश आ रहा है, तो आपको मर्यादा को कायम रखने के लिये, यहां पर अच्छी-अच्छी कन्वेन्शन स्थापित करने के लिये, भविष्य में पार्लियामेन्ट ठीक तरह से चले . . . (**व्यवधान**) . . . इनको इस्तीफ़ा दे देना चाहिये ।

Mr. Speaker: Now, no Member should take more than two minutes.

Now it is not the privilege motion, but it is only the point on the discussion of PAC report.

श्री ह० ना० तिवारी (बगहा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सवाल परम्परा का नहीं है, . .

श्री मधु लिमये : लेकिन इस से सम्बन्धित है, सुब्रह्मण्यम साहब के बयान का जवाब कैसे देंगे, जब तक सारी बातें नहीं मिलेंगी ।

श्री ह० ना० तिवारी : यह बात परम्परा की नहीं है, औचित्य की बात है । हमारी कमेटी में आफिशियल्ज थोड़े आते हैं, लेकिन पब्लिक आर्गेनिजेशन्ज और पब्लिक कारपोरेशन के मैनेजर और मैनेजिंग डाइरेक्टर बहुत ज्यादा आते हैं और वे लोग ऐसी बातें कहते हैं, जो गवर्नमेन्ट की पालिसी के खिलाफ़ होती हैं । उनके आर्डर के खिलाफ होती हैं और कभी-कभी मिनिस्टरों की बातों के खिलाफ़ होती हैं । यदि यह इजाजत दे दी जाय कि उनकी एविडेन्सेज को दिखाया जायगा, तो ये सब बातें हम लोगों को मिलनी दुश्वार हो जायेंगी । इसलिये मैं चाहता हूं कि एविडेन्स नहीं, लेकिन उनका जो रिपोर्ट है उसके बाद जो समरी आती है उसको दिखना दिया जाय । लेकिन वर्बेटिम एविडेन्स दिखलाना उचित नहीं है ।

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): There are two separate ond distinct parts of the whole question.

The first part of the question relates to the evidence of the Minister and the access of the members of this House to that evidence. So far as the evidence of the Minister is concerned, it was tendered at his own instance. It is not customary for the Public Accounts Committee to examine a Minister or to permit him to address the Committee. It was, however, permitted and since this was done at his own instance, I do not think that there can be any objection, whatever, to that evidence being laid before the House.

The second aspect of the matter concerns rule 275(2). That is a rule which, I think, has been enacted largely to safeguard the efficient and effective functioning of the Committee. The rule says: that no part of the evidence shall be open to inspection by any one except under the authority of the Speaker. What it means is that there is a very limited access under special circumstances in which the Speaker is called upon to exercise his discretion. In this respect it is for you to come to a conclusion whether you would allow inspection, whether you would allow access to that particular evidence in respect of this case. Therefore, I think that no furtrer discussion is really called for.

Shri G. N. Dixit (Etawah): On a point of order.

I invite your attention to Direction 58, Chapter VIII-Parliamentary Committees—of "Directions by the Speaker". This is relevant to the point at issue. I am reading this:

"Where witnesses appear before a Committee to give evidence, the Chairman shall make it clear to the witnesses that their evidence shall be treated as public and is liable to be published, unless they

specifically desire that all or any part of the evidence tendered by them is to be treated as confidential. It shall however, be explained to the witnesses that even though they might desire their evidence to be treated as confidential, such evidence is liable to be made available to the members of Parliament."

Shri R. S. Pandey (Guna): To which committee does this apply? He has not said that. That should be made very clear.

Shri Sheo Narain (Bansi): It refers to select committees and not to PAC.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): It is for all Parliamentary committees.

Mr. Speaker: This direction is applicable to all committees. It is not specified there that it is simply for select committees. But after that, we have adopted this practice, whatever it might be, that the evidence of witnesses shall not be disclosed; as we have just now read also, it might be done with the Speaker's permission. I am not inclined to allow the publication of all evidence, but so far as the Minister's evidence is concerned, I shall have it made available.

An hon. Member: That is the compromise.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: In my letter I had asked you, under this rule, to permit me for inspection . . .

Mr. Speaker: It is only the member who wants to see . . .

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Members of the Committee?

Mr. Speaker: Members of Parliament.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: In my letter I have made a request that, since the evidence has not been published, I may be permitted to inspect the evidence.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; he is permitted. The other members also, who want to see, will intimate to me and I will allow them to see it—only the Minister's evidence.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Regarding the Minister's evidence, you have now permitted it to be put on the Table of the House.

Mr. Speaker: The evidence might be made known, but not all the evidence.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy: Let us understand what it is. You have now ruled that the evidence of the Minister, so far as it relates to the 55th report would be put on the Table of the House. Since this matter also relates to the 50th report, I had requested you to permit access to the evidence in connection with that report also, which you are not allowing to be laid on the Table of the House; I do not press for it, but under the rules, I have requested you to permit me to have inspection of that evidence also.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Even in British times, we used to have access to it.

Mr. Speaker: I shall consider this aspect.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I request that so far as the other evidence is concerned, the proviso to sub-rule (3) of rule 275 may apply?

Mr. Speaker: Very well.

Shri Daji (Indore): The statement of the Minister must be circulated to us.

13.10 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

ACCOUNTS OF I.I.T., KHARAGPUR

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Certified Accounts of the Indian Institute of Technology,