

Double Broad Gauge Lines

1631. Shri Shree Narayan Das: Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) whether any proposal to have a double broad gauge line between Samastipur and Muzaffarpur via Darbhanga is being considered by the North Eastern Railway;

(b) if so, the stage of its consideration;

(c) the important features of the scheme; and

(d) the programme for its undertaking?

The Deputy Minister of Railways (Shri S. V. Ramaswamy): (a) The hon. Member is presumably referring to proposal for doubling the Samastipur-Darbhanga Section and the alternate scheme for a new line from Darbhanga to Muzaffarpur, both to the Metre Gauge. If so, the proposals have been surveyed.

(b) The survey reports are under examination.

(c) and (d) Do not arise in view of (b).

12.06 hrs.

RE: ARREST OF TWO MEMBERS

Mr. Speaker: Now, Papers to be laid on the Table.

Shri Tangamani (Madurai): May I make a submission? Two Members of this House, Shri Sampath and Shri Dharmalingam were arrested during the last session for defying certain orders. I find from the information that we have received that they were sentenced to either pay a fine of Rs. 25 or undergo simple imprisonment for fifteen days. That happened on the 3rd of this month. I understand also that they have refused to pay the fine, and they would prefer to go to jail.

I would like to know whether any communication has been received from the Presidency Magistrate or

from the State Government. But it is quite possible that after they go to jail, the sentence is likely to be remitted. What I want to know is whether any communication....

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members ought not to interrupt proceedings in this manner. The hon. Member could easily have written to me or gone to the office. Why should it be taken up now? If he had only told me, I would have found out. How can I carry all this information?

Shri Tangamani: All that I want to know is whether such communication....

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member would not be allowed to know all that here. He knows it well that we have got certain agenda here. If he had only sent a chit to me, I would have asked the Secretary to give him the information. I have also to go through it, because I do not know.

Shri Tangamani: I want to know..

Mr. Speaker: It is wrong. Our time is precious here. If he had only informed me or seen the Secretary or gone to the Notice Office, he could have had this information. In the Notice Office, I have posted a Superintendent for this purpose. Hon. Members may be aware of this, but I shall tell them once again, though I constantly refer to it in the Bulletin. Since nearly a year ago, I have posted a Superintendent in the Notice Office with a stenographer; and whoever wants to know anything about Parliament may go to him; and it is his duty to give him sufficient information. If the hon. Member is not satisfied, then he should mark it for me, and I shall send for the hon. Member. I am trying to provide as many conveniences as possible to avoid any hon. Member coming up here with these things. How can I carry all this information? If the hon. Member himself were here, can I ask about all the Members of Parliament who have gone to jail?

Shri Tangamani: It is not about all those persons. If...

Mr. Speaker: He cannot say, 'if' or 'but' now.

Shri Tangamani: 48 hours have passed since the sentence, and that is why I have brought it to the notice of the House.

Mr. Speaker: It is very wrong. He ought not to bring it to the notice of the House like this. If there is any grievance, he could write to me, and I could give him the information. Or, if he wants to condemn any particular person, there are motions for that purpose. The motions are already given. If I agree, I shall bring them up. It is very wrong to raise it in this manner.

Shri Tangamani: If.....

Mr. Speaker: I cannot say 'if' or 'but'.

Shri Tangamani: 48 hours have passed. I have brought it to the notice of the House....

Mr. Speaker: It is very wrong. The hon. Member ought not to bring it to the notice of the House like this. If there is any grievance, he could write to me and I would have given him the information. Or if he wants to condemn any particular person, there are motions and if I agree, I will bring them up here. But this sort of procedure is very wrong.

Shrimati Renu Chakravarty: I would just like to ask one thing. I think normally this is done. Recently in the case of Shri Yajnik when he was sentenced, the matter was communicated to the House. So I was just wondering whether normally this is not done.

Mr. Speaker: Who ever denies it? If any Member of Parliament is arrested, the Magistrate must communicate it to me. If he is released, that also is communicated to me. I am not in a position to say whether in this case it has been communicated or I have read it out here. Hon. Members might have been watching. On some days they are not here. I also do not exactly remember what all cases I have read out here. If he gives me

intimation, I will find out and then take steps myself, if necessary, to raise it on the floor of the House. I would have allowed the hon. Member to do so. There is no good taking me by surprise. I am not disallowing anything.

Shri Satya Narayan Sinha.

12.12 hrs.

RE: MOTION OF PRIVILEGE

Shrimati Manjula Devi (Goalpara): I have given notice of a motion of privilege, and as it is very urgent and important, I request you to read it out to the House, and allow me to move the motion.

Mr. Speaker: I will not allow her to move it. The hon. Member came to me with a motion of privilege and gave it to me. Under the rules, I am entitled to look into the matter before I bring it up before the House, whether it is really a matter of privilege or not. She told me about this when I was entering the Chamber. Then I said that normally, if I find that there is a *prima facie* case, I bring it before the House; otherwise, I take the advice of the Privileges Committee. Opinions also can be asked for. I have sent it to the Privileges Committee. But the hon. Member told me that she wanted to go away. Therefore, the whole House must tune itself to her convenience. I then asked when she was returning. She said, on the 14th. Then I said that in the meanwhile I would not pass any orders; I would wait till she came back. Then she said: 'No, no. You must bring it up today'. I must adjourn the House to hear this matter! This is meaningless. She wants the House to discuss this according to her convenience and I must adjourn the business of the House for that! The business of the House ought not to