

Khadi Bhavan (Stt.)

apologised to you, but he has misled the entire country by giving that letter to *Current*.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : जो आपका वक्त्रचन आफ प्रिन्सिपल है वह कमेटी के पास भेजा जायेगा ।

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पूरा जाना चाहिये और उन लोगों को सख्त सजा देनी चाहिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इसमें झगड़े की क्या बात है जब मैं भेज रहा हूँ ।

श्री मधु लिमये : पूरा जायेगा तब मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है ।

12.21 hrs.

PUBLICATION OF REGRET BY
 NAVASAKTHI OF MADRAS

Mr. Speaker: On the 5th August, 1966 the House had accepted the regret expressed by the Editor of *Navasakthi*, Madras in respect of a news-report published in its issue dated the 26th July, 1966. While treating the matter as closed, the House had directed that the Editor of the '*Navasakthi*' should be asked to publish the regret on the front page of the newspaper in three successive issues.

I have now to inform the House that the explanation and the regret of the Editor were published on the front page of the three successive issues of the newspaper dated the 10th, 11th and 12th August, 1966, copies of which the Editor has sent to me for information.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, I rise on a point of clarification. I am happy, and so is the House, I am sure, that the Parliament has been able to assert itself effectively in this matter. May I request you, Sir, to tell the House what exactly the text of the apology is that has been carried in the paper, a translation of it—I know it is in Tamil—for the House to judge whether the

apology is adequate in the circumstances. If it is not adequate the House will have to take further action.

Mr. Speaker: That was printed in the paper. I have not got the paper with me.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You may mention the date, the column, the age and all that.

Mr. Speaker: It will be kept in the Library.

12.23 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE
 MOTOR VEHICLES (2ND AMENDMENT)
 RULES

The Minister of Transport, Aviation Shipping and Tourism (Shri Sanjiva Reddy): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table:

- (1) A copy of the Delhi Motor Vehicles (2nd Amendment) Rules, 1964, published in Notification No. F.20(5)/63-PR (T) in Delhi Gazette dated the 13th January, 1966, under sub-section (3) of section 133 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939.
- (2) A statement showing reasons for delay in laying the above Notification.

[Placed in Library, See No. LT-6843/66].

Mr. Speaker: Before I proceed further, I may inform the House that there are three statements to be made today on Gold Control Order, Teachers' Strike and Cow Slaughter. Therefore, hon. Members should hold on with patience.

Now, Shri Manubhai Shah may place his statement on the Table.

STATEMENT REGARDING SALE OF
 STANDARD HONEY AND
 MATCH-BOXES BY THE
 KHADI AND GRAMODYOG
 BHAVAN

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, before Shri Manubhai

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath.]

Shah lays it on the Table, I rise on a point of order. As far as I am aware a question was raised in the House with regard to the prosecution of the Khadi Gramodyog Bhawan, New Delhi for sale of adulterated honey and the question was answered some days ago. If I remember the answer aright, a prosecution is pending in a court of law, prosecution against the Khadi Gramodyog Bhawan for sale of adulterated honey, before a Delhi Magistrate.

I will invite your attention, Sir, to Rule 352 which says:

"A member while speaking shall not refer to any matter of fact on which a judicial decision is pending."

I suppose, I take it for granted, that "a member while speaking" is a very comprehensive phrase, a wide embracing term and "while speaking" will include also a Minister laying a paper on the Table of the House and it will not be restricted to Members asking questions or making speeches here. Now, if the matter is *sub judice* in a court of law, if a statement is laid on the Table by a minister relating to that subject, will it or will it not prejudice the trial? I do not know what the statement contains, but the statement is a premature statement, in any case, regarding Khadi Gramodyog Bhawan. I am sure the Government is interested in one of its own creations, but you must help the House to judge whether a statement placed on the Table now will or will not prejudice the issue before the court of law.

श्री हुकूम चन्द कश्यप (देवास) : आपने जो कहा है कि स्टेटमेंट होगा गोहत्या के बारे में और स्वर्ण नियन्त्रण के बारे में वह क्व हो रहा है, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह आ रहा है। अब आप मुझे सुनने दीजिये।

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Manubhai Shah): Sir, I have taken

into account the comments made by the hon. Member. This statement does not go against that.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Sir, you must see it first and then decide, whether it can be laid on the Table. He may lay it tomorrow.

Shri Manubhai Shah: I have taken into account all those points.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It is for the Speaker to decide, not the Minister.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Sir, apart from the objection raised by Shri Kamath, my objection is that the whole question came up when the newspaper gave a report that this adulterated honey was seized by an inspector who was responsible to check adulteration. I am surprised to see that the Minister, Shri Manubhai Shah, who is connected with the Khadi Commission—it is under his Ministry—is making a statement on adulteration. It should have come from the Health Minister or someone else. It is a peculiar thing, his defending the Khadi Commission.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandasaur): The accused making a statement.

Mr. Speaker: I am reading the statement. There is nothing....

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): Why should he make a statement then?

Shri Manubhai Shah: If the hon. House hears the statement, they would not find anything offending in that.

Mr. Speaker: The portion about honey might be read to the House.

Shri Manubhai Shah: If the hon. House is interested in hearing the facts as we have verified, it is up to them....

Shri U. M. Trivedi: No, no; not at all.

Mr. Speaker: Because a case is pending in court, no facts should be stated.

Shri Manubhai Shah: They are not of that nature. It is only about the action taken about the Manager.

Mr. Speaker: The action taken or what they have done would not prejudice the proceedings there.

Shri Daji (Indore): Of course.... (Interruption).

Mr. Speaker: No, no... (Interruption). What they have done is a different thing altogether.

Shri Daji: If they have exonerated him, it will include and if they have punished him, even then it will include.

Mr. Speaker: There is no question of exonerating or punishing him. What precautions they should take that this should not happen, only that much is to be said. Now the Minister may lay it on the Table.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंनेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मंत्री महोदय मिलावटी शहद के बारे में अगर कोई ऐसी बात कहने वाले हैं, मैंने उनके बयान को नहीं देखा है, जिससे जो मुकदमा चल रहा है उस पर अगर पड़े तो वह मैच बाक्स के बारे में बयान दे क्योंकि वह मामला अदालत में नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह बात हो गई।

Shri U. M. Trivedi: The hon. Minister says that he wants to make some statement with reference to the facts. We are not aware as to what are they. Unless and until you have satisfied yourself as to what statement he is going to make, the statement should not be allowed to be made, because it is likely to prejudice the case; there is a chance. He not being a lawyer himself and not a practising lawyer, at that, he does not know what are

the implications of a sub judice matter.

Mr. Speaker: He is not making any comments about the facts of the case or as to what happened at that time. Absolutely he is not touching those facts at all.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Then it is irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker: No. It is about how they would see that such a thing does not happen in future and what steps they should take in that regard.... (Interruption). I have seen it.

Shri Manubhai Shah: The statement that I am making is regarding the matter raised about the sale of sub-standard honey and matchboxes.

On the 18th August you asked me to enquire into some complaints received by you from some Members of Parliament that matchboxes were being sold in the local Khadi Gramodyog Bhawan which bore an excise banderol showing the words and figures "Matches 50" but which actually contained 25 matchsticks.

श्री मधु लिमये : नाम लेने में क्यों ऐतराज है। यह अनेक सदस्यों ने नहीं कहा था, मैंने कहा था। नाम लेने में क्या आपत्ति है। सत्य बताया जाये।

Shri Manubhai Shah: I do not mind taking his name. The hon. Speaker gave me two or three names; he gave me more than one name, I can mention all of them. After all, I am making a statement and there should be some tolerance.

It was also felt that this was likely to mislead the public and, therefore, the matter should be thoroughly enquired into. As I wrote to you earlier, I immediately enquired into the matter. The actual position is as under.

It was not the intention of the Khadi Gramodyog Bhavan or the Khadi Commission to sell fewer matches than what is mentioned on

[Shri Manubhai Shah]

the banderol. Therefore, the Khadi Commission had adopted the procedure of generally over stamping by a rubber-stamp "25 sticks".... (Interruption).

श्री मधु लिमये : अध्यक्ष महोदय, बड़ा बेलराज है मुझे। यह गलत बयानी कर रहे हैं। आपको जो बक्सा मैंने दिखलाया था और श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती को भी दिखलाया था उस पर कोई रबर स्टैम्प नहीं था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप बैठ जाइये। मुझे सुनने दीजिये।

श्री मधु लिमये : झूठ बोलते हैं।

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara) : Let us have some kind of.... (Interruption).

Shri Manubhai Shah: There should be some method of procedure in this House. I am standing on my legs. I have the protection of the Chair and I am standing on my legs.

श्री मधु लिमये : मुझे भी होना चाहिये।

Shri Manubhai Shah: We have heard you enough. Now you listen to us... (Interruption). There has been enough bullying in this country. Now you will have to listen to us.

श्री मधु लिमये : ठीक है, मैं भी जानता हूँ आपके कारनामों को।

Shri Manubhai Shah: Therefore, the Khadi Commission had adopted the procedure of generally over stamping by a rubber stamp "25 sticks" even when the banderol used was for "50 matches" as the Excise authorities could not supply them banderols for 25 matches. Even though the technical explanation offered by the Commission and verified by me from the Central Board of Excise and Customs is satisfactory and permissible under the Central Excise Regulations, I have immediately ordered the withdrawal from the sales of all such

match boxes as it is likely to create a wrong impression among the common buyers because of the prominent words appearing on the banderol of "50 matches".

Khadi Commission has agreed to withdraw such match boxes from all their Sales Depots and Emporiums and they will refill these boxes with 50 sticks as long as they have to use the banderol of 50 matches. In future, the actual number of sticks contained in the match boxes will have to conform to the number of sticks, if any, mentioned on the banderol. I hope this arrangement will be considered satisfactory.

The sale of some sub-standard honey in the Khadi Gramodyog Bhavan, New Delhi, was referred to in the House. The position is that as the Inspector of New Delhi Municipal Committee found the honey to be sub-standard, the New Delhi Municipal Committee has instituted a prosecution against the Manager of the Bhavan. The sale of the existing honey in stock in the Khadi Gramodyog Bhavan, which may be lower than the standard, has been ordered to be stopped. Also the Khadi Commission has been requested to let the Manager of the Khadi Gramodyog Bhavan proceed on leave immediately pending completion of inquiry.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): I would like to know whether the match box containing 25 sticks was sold at half the price or at the price of the cost of 50 sticks.

Shri Manubhai Shah: At the price of 25 sticks.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं एक स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ—

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब और क्या स्पष्टीकरण की जरूरत है?

श्री मधु लिमये : आप सुनोगे तभी तो आपको पता चलेगा।

मैंने इसके बारे में ध्यान दिलाने का एक प्रस्ताव दिया था, उसको आपने स्वीकार नहीं किया। मैं इसकी शिकायत नहीं कर रहा हूँ। फिर मैंने कहा कि पुनर्विचार कीजिये, वह भी नहीं हुआ। नियम समिति की बैठक में जब मैं आया था तो मेरे अटैची में वह सारी चीज थी। आपके सामने मैंने रखी थी माचिस के बक्स पर कोई रबर स्टैम्प नहीं था। आपने खोलकर देखा, रेणु चक्रवर्ती साहिब ने खोल कर देखा और 24 और 25 स्टिक्स मिलीं। अब मेरे पास एक नई रसीद और एक नया बक्स मौजूद है। आज लाया नहीं हूँ क्योंकि मुझे पता नहीं था कि कोई इस तरह का बयान आज वह करने वाले है। मैं कल आपकी इजाजत से लाऊंगा। उस पर दाम बढ़ा दिया गया है। दस पैसे कर दिया गया है। रबर स्टैम्प भी लग गई है। आपकी अन्दर 25 ही मिलेंगी। सात पैसे जिसका पहले दाम था उसका अब दस पैसे है . . .

श्री त्यागी : 25 का दाम दस पैसे का दिया गया है ?

श्री मधु लिमये : पहले उसका दाम सात पैसे था, अब दस पैसे कर दिया गया है। पहले कोई रबर स्टैम्प नहीं था। अन्दर 25 मिलीं। अब रबर स्टैम्प लग गया है। अब बंड रॉय पचास का है और उस पर स्टैम्प पच्चीस की लगी हुई है और दाम दस पैसे है। मैं आपकी खिदमत में इसको कल पेश करने वाला हूँ। खादी और आन्दोलन के साथ महात्मा गांधी का नाम जुड़ा हुआ है। क्या महात्मा गांधी का अमानत आप इन तरह से करते रहेंगे? आप हमें ही उसका अमानत करते रहते हैं।

Mr. Speaker: आर्डर, आर्डर !

Shri Subramaniam.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: (Ambalappuzha): Is it true that the price has been increased? Will you please ascertain whether the price has been increased to 10 p.? It is a very pertinent question.

1457(Ai)LS—7

Mr. Speaker: We will see when that comes. Shri Subramaniam:

श्री यशपाल सिंह (कैराना) : एक छोटी सी बात में भी कहना चाहता हूँ। एक मिनट का मुझे भी मौका दिया जाए।

श्री हुकूम चन्द कछवाय : अध्यक्ष महोदय . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : खड़े होकर हर एक सदस्य इस तरह से बोलना शुरू करदे जिसने न कोई समझ सके और न कोई जवाब दे सके तो कहां तक ठीक है। यह एक प्रान तरीका हो गया है। पांच पांच सात सात सदस्य एक साथ खड़े होकर बोलना शुरू कर देते हैं। क्या इन तरह से सदन की कार्यवाही चल सकती है . . .

श्री हुकूम चन्द कछवाय : मौका भी हमको नहीं मिलता है बोलने का। इस तरह से नहीं चलेंगे तो . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्य अर्ज की दफा अगर स्पीकर हुए तो आप इस तरह से कैला कर लेना। मैं नहीं कर सकता हूँ।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : माननीय मंत्री जी इन बातों को क्यों छिपा रहे हैं कि जो शब्द पकड़ा गया है वह पूना की लैबोरेटरी से प्रशुद्ध जाति हो चुका है और उसमें दूषित तत्व है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अगर इतना धरती चल रही है तो इतना हमें नहीं कहना चाहिये।

श्री यशपाल सिंह : क्यों इतनी छिपाया जा रहा है जिस शब्द ने शब्द में एजाजेशन किया है उसको बरखास्त क्यों नहीं किया जा रहा है, उसको छुड़ाने पर जाने की शिफारिश क्यों की गई है? उसकी बरखास्त क्यों नहीं किया गया है ?

Mr. Speaker: Thakur Sahib gets so lost in his own assertions that he never listens, never hears and never even looks to the Speaker as to what he is asking him. I have every respect for him but there ought to be some decorum in the House.

जब यह अदालत में चल रहा है कि शुद्ध है या नहीं है तो यहां इस तरह से आप क्यों कहते जा रहे हैं? यही तो ऐतराज किया है कामत साहब ने।

12.34 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

—Contd.

NOTIFICATION MAKING CERTAIN AMENDMENT TO KERALA SURVEY AND BOUNDARIES RULES, 1964

The Minister of Food, Agriculture, Community Development and Co-operation (Shri C. Subramaniam): I lay on the Table a copy of Notification S.R.O. No. 285/66, published in Kerala Gazette dated the 2nd August, 1966, making certain amendment to the Kerala Survey and Boundaries Rules, 1964, under sub-section (3) of section 22 of the Kerala Survey and Boundaries Act, 1961 read with clause (c) (iv) of the Proclamation dated the 24th March, 1965, issued by the Vice-President, discharging the functions of the President, in relation to the State of Kerala. [Placed in Library. See No. LH-6844/66.]

Mr. Speaker: Has Mr. Subramaniam laid his papers on the Table?

Shri C. Subramaniam: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Bhagat.

THE PUNJAB LAND REVENUE (SECOND AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1966, ETC.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Finance (Shri B. R. Bhagat): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Ordinances, under provisions of Article 213(2) (a) of the Constitution read with clause (c) (iv)

of the Proclamation dated the 5th July, 1966, issued by the President, in relation to the State of Punjab:

(1) The Punjab Land Revenue (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1966 (No. 4 of 1966) promulgated by the Governor of Punjab on the 25th June, 1966. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6845/66].

(2) The Punjab Passengers and Goods Taxation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1966 (No. 5 of 1966) promulgated by the Governor of Punjab on the 1st July, 1966. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6846/66].

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Before the next item is reached. I rise on a point of order as well as clarification on Item No. 6 standing in the name of Mr. B. R. Bhagat.

You will be pleased to see that this item refers to a copy each of two Ordinances relating to the State of Punjab which is your own native State and a State which is very dear to me and to all of us here.

Mr. Speaker: Is it because it is mine or for some other reason?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I said 'and' and not 'because of that'.

May I invite your attention to Article 213—Legislative Power of the Governor. Before I read that Article, I would point out a statement of fact in regard to this item.

The Ordinances were promulgated on the 25th of June and the 1st of July, respectively; it is in the list of business, in the order paper, that they were promulgated on the 25th of June and the 1st of July. The President's rule was enforced, the proclamation about the President's rule was promulgated, on the 5th of July. That is to say, before the promulgation of the proclamation under which Punjab was taken over by the President, the two Ordinances were promulgated. Now let us see what Article 213 says. The Legislature at that time was not in