

(5) Supplementary Statement No. XVIII, Tenth Session, 1955 of Lok Sabha. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 125]

(6) Supplementary Statement No. XXIV, Ninth Session, 1955 of Lok Sabha. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 126]

(7) Supplementary Statement No. XXVII, Eighth Session, 1954 of Lok Sabha. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 127]

PRINCIPAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENTS BETWEEN GOVERNOR OF RAJASTHAN AND RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

The Minister of Revenue and Defence Expenditure (Shri A. C. Guha): I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (2) of section 21A of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, a copy of each of the Principal and Supplemental Agreements between the Governor of Rajasthan and the Reserve Bank of India. [See Appendix V, annexure No. 128]

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following messages received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:

(i) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 125 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 19th December, 1956, agreed without any amendment to the Employees' Provident Funds (Amendment) Bill, 1956, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 8th December, 1956."

(ii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 125 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 19th December, 1956, agreed without any amendment to the Electricity (Supply) Amendment Bill, 1956, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 11th December, 1956."

ARIYALUR TRAIN DISASTER

TELEGRAM RECEIVED BY SHRI KAMATH LAID ON THE TABLE

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): Before you proceed to other business, may I make one earnest submission to you for your close consideration? The other day, Shri Alagesan made a statement on the Ariyalur train disaster; and I told you and the House that I had mislaid Mr. Govindan's letter. It was unfortunate, and I felt pained at it, that some of my colleagues were chuckling rather sceptically at the time. Yesterday afternoon, I got a telegram from Mr. Govindan, and I shall pass it on you for your consideration, and I also lay it on the Table of the House [See Appendix V, annexure No. 129]

The telegram reads as follows:

"REGRET YOU MISLAID MY LETTER PLEASE PRESS GOVERNMENT TO ORDER ENQUIRY INTO BURNING OF BODIES AND BURNING OF LADIES COMPARTMENT IN ARIYALUR DISASTER I AM PREPARED TO GIVE EVIDENCE LETTER FOLLOWS"

And it is signed by Mr. R. Govindan.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member must have waited till the letter had followed.

Shri Kamath: Tomorrow is the last day of this session.

Shri Alagesan made a very unfair charge against me that I had tried to seek political advantage out of that. There was nothing of that kind. He did not even consult me before. Under the rules, I believe, even you might have suggested to me that he was going to make a statement, and that I could say something if I wanted.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member was present here. Otherwise, he would have been sent for. Since he was present here, there was no need to send for him.

Shri Kamath: Before a statement like that is made, I think under the rules or conventions the other Members concerned are always informed that the statement is going to be made.

Mr. Speaker: True. But the hon. Member was present here. Otherwise, I would have passed on the information to him.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Prior intimation is given. I remember once before it had happened, and Shri H. N. Mukerjee was informed beforehand.

Mr. Speaker: That telegram may be filed.

Shri Kamath: When the letter comes, I shall pass it on to you.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): On this matter of prior notice, I would like to submit to you one thing, and it is this that the Minister came forward suggesting that steps be taken on a question of privilege against the particular Member, and naturally, the press gave a great deal of publicity to it. At the moment, I, for one, did not know that Shri Kamath did not have prior intimation. If he had prior intimation, he might have told the Minister certain things which would have prevented our bruising in the House certain matters which should not be mentioned in the House before certain preliminaries are completed.

I look up to you as the custodian of our rights, and particularly of the Opposition who are so easily sneered at by certain elements on the other side, I look up to you to safeguard our position. I did not happen to know that Shri Kamath did not have prior intimation. But I feel that it is for you to uphold our rights and privileges as far as this kind of serious charge and counter-charge is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: I fully appreciate the observations made by Shri H. N. Mukerjee. I have been repeatedly telling hon. Members here that before

any hon. Member makes any such serious charge against any Ministry or department of the Government, he should also give intimation to the other side, to the Minister, so that he may come prepared and try to answer and to remove any difficulty in advance.

Shri Kamath: He said it was a breach of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Whether it is a breach of privilege or not, this is a serious allegation that people are set fire to in compartment and so on and so forth. I have repeatedly suggested to hon. Members that with respect to any particular and serious charge like this, the matter may be communicated to the Minister concerned. After all, the Ministers are not miles away, and whatever differences there were could have been removed. That was not done in this case.

Of course, so far as this is concerned, when a proper motion comes in, I just ask the other side. It is not as if I do not communicate. Therefore, I have the least objection to follow this practice. Whichever hon. Member wants to make a serious charge against Government with respect to any particular matter, regarding which they have to be forewarned, may write to the Government and give them an opportunity to place their case before the House. I say this because whatever statement is made here is given currency in newspapers, and even though it may be explained later, the damage is already done. Therefore, this is an advice not only to the Government but also to the other side.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty rose—

Mr. Speaker: Let the hon. lady Member be a little more patient.

Therefore, whenever serious allegations are made, I will certainly insist upon hon. Members informing the other side beforehand, and if still it is not cleared, then make the statement. I shall certainly observe this

rule, but it will be applicable to both sides.

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): Two-way traffic.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Cannanore): When we speak on Bills and other things, certain references may have to be made. According to your ruling, we will have to inform the other side about the charges beforehand. How can we write to them beforehand?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member comes prepared with a letter written by somebody and then on the strength of that letter, makes certain charges. It is not something said casually in the course of the debate. When such a serious charge is made in respect of a particular matter and with respect to which the hon. Minister must come prepared, what is the harm in passing it on beforehand?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I clarify the position? The documents which Shri Kamath referred to were received by me also but without a covering letter. Those documents were printed, and referred to certain proceedings which were reported in a particular South Indian newspaper. Now, when we refer to that kind of document, we do not vouch for the accuracy of that particular allegation, but we merely want that Government should have its notice drawn to it. We do not make an aspersion on the *bona fides* of Government.

Mr. Speaker: The misfortune is that the hon. Member was not here then. If Shri Kamath had merely said, 'I find from a report in a newspaper about certain proceedings wherein one person, Shri Govindan, who seems to have been an eye-witness said such and such thing', that would have been another matter. But he said, 'I have received from one Shri Govindan a letter'.

Shri Kamath: There was a letter to me.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member, Shri H. N. Mukerjee, does not know

the full facts. He says, 'Just one fine morning, we find something in some newspaper. What is the harm in referring to it?' I have no objection. But here the case is different. Shri Kamath said that he had received a letter from Shri Govindan containing serious allegations. He should have given previous intimation before he made this allegation. Everyday we hear of so many reports. There is no harm in referring to them. But this is a peculiar case where an hon. Member said that he received a letter, and the other side said, 'Show me the letter', whereupon Shri Kamath said that he lost the letter, and I accepted his word.

When he merely based it on a newspaper report, the hon. Minister wanted to say that it was a breach of privilege of the House.

Under these circumstances, let this be the rule for each side. Each side has to inform the other side in future whenever a serious charge is levelled, so that the other side may come equally prepared to answer the charge or plaint.

Shri Kamath: May I have a clarification? Your ruling is an important and helpful ruling. But may I ask a question? Suppose we get a document on a certain subject in the morning. If it has to be passed on to the Minister, he will take time to go into it. Then what shall we do with that? What is the position?

Mr. Speaker: Even if he had not investigated it, the hon. Minister could say: 'I did not have time to look into it. Therefore, I seek the indulgence of the Chair to put it off for my explanation'. He could always make that statement, in which case Shri Kamath could easily say, 'I showed it earlier to him. There have been two hours. He could have got the information on the trunk telephone'. The Minister will be in a worse position than this if he had not been informed at all about it earlier.

[Mr. Speaker]

Under these circumstances, let us stop any further discussion on this matter.

Shri Thanu Pillai (Tirunelveli): I rise to ask on the question which was discussed now.....

Mr. Speaker: That has been finished. We cannot go into it again. The hon. Member is not concerned with it now.

Shri Thanu Pillai: No, Sir. I am vitally concerned, because I come from that State.

Mr. Speaker: He did not take part in the discussion earlier.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

THIRTY-FIFTH TO THIRTY-SEVENTH AND
FORTIETH REPORTS

श्री ब० गो० महता (गोहिलवाड़) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्राक्कलन समिति की
मिम्नलिखित रिपोर्टें पेश करता हूँ :

(१) समिति की पहली, दूसरी
और तीसरी रिपोर्टों में दी गई
सिफारिशों पर सरकार द्वारा की
गई कार्यवाही के सम्बन्ध
में पैंतीसवीं, छत्तीसवीं और
सैंतीसवीं रिपोर्टें और

(२) सामुदायिक विकास मंत्रालय
(सामुदायिक परियोजना प्रशा-
लन) के सम्बन्ध में चालीसवीं
रिपोर्टें—भाग २ ।

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Minister in the Ministry of Home Affairs (Shri Datar): May I make a special Motion? There is one Bill which has not been placed on today's agenda, but which is a matter of considerable importance. It is the **Foreigners (Laws) Amendment Bill**. If you would agree, it may be taken up after the main business of today is over.

Mr. Speaker: If we find the time.

Some Hon. Members: Tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: I believe one hour has been allotted for it.

Shri Datar: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: That will be the minimum for any Bill that is taken notice of by the Committee. But today we have got non-official business also.

Shri Datar: That is at 16:30 hours.

Mr. Speaker: If we finish the Banking Companies (Amendment) Bill earlier, we can devote whatever time is left to that.

Some Hon. Members: It must stand over.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty (Basirhat): The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is here. We in the Business Advisory Committee have been asking him day after day to tell us what is the priority. He said, 'That is none of your business'. It is our business. We come prepared to discuss what we see in the agenda paper. But we cannot immediately and suddenly come prepared to discuss a Bill that has not been on the agenda. We can discuss it tomorrow; I do not think we should be asked to consider it today.

Mr. Speaker: Very well.

Shri Kamath (Hoshangabad): On a point of order with regard to the order paper. You will be pleased to see that the U.P.S.C. Report had been fixed for discussion today, but it has been postponed to tomorrow, the last day of this session. This is an important matter and I would request you to so arrange the business, or ask the Minister to do it, that this Report is taken up earlier, as the penultimate item. Then the House may sit as long as may be necessary to dispose of the Press Council Bill. That will be much better.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.