

[Mr. Speaker]

Members will look into it and make suggestions as to what more has to be done. Now I would not like to stand in the way of the Finance Bill being taken up immediately. So, this is over.

Shrimati Renuka Ray: Before you go to the next point, I have one question to ask of the hon. Minister. Is it not a fact that some of those who have not got photographs and who wanted to get them have been deliberately dissuaded from getting them so as to gain some objective? (Interruptions.)

Mr. Speaker: Both the hon. Members are coming from the same State.

Shri Tyagi: We now see the secret.

—
12.16 hrs.

RE. MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT

ALLEGED FAILURE TO MEET DEMANDS OF MANIPUR PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker: I have received notice of another adjournment motion from Shri Braj Raj Singh and also Shri Hem Barua. What is it that he wants to achieve by giving notice of this motion? He says:

"Failure of the Union Government to meet the demands of the people of Manipur with respect to:

(1) grant of responsible Government to Manipuris."

So, we have an adjournment motion here, condemning the Government, for acting according to the Constitution for which we, all of us, remain responsible. So long as the Constitution remains, the Government must be continued. If they go against the Constitution, if they straightforwardly, without coming to this House, grant independence to Manipur because Shri Braj Raj Singh forces them to do so, or because his party, the Socialist Party, has undertaken this *Satyagraha* which they are going to start from tomorrow or today, if the Government surrender all their rights, would

not that be a subject matter of an adjournment motion rather than this one? Now, I do not want to shut out any political party from trying to get full-fledged government for the people. The people also may be interested in having full-fledged freedom by having a separate State. The demand may also be legitimate. But for that they must move this House by resolutions and if the House accepts the proposals, Government will certainly modify their own proposals. Or the hon. Members themselves can introduce an amending Bill to amend the Constitution. If they can carry the House with them they can certainly do so.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): The adjournment motion does not relate only to responsible Government.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Firozabad): In my adjournment motion I have also suggested:

"(2) fixation of prices of agricultural commodities in such a manner that the profits on them would at no time during the year rise by more than an anna per seer (3) making the uneconomic agricultural holdings rent free; (4) removal of English as the language of administration in Manipur and replacement of it by Manipuri; (5) reserving 60 per cent. of the Government posts for backward classes, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, etc., as a result of which mass strikes and demonstrations have taken place in Manipur and satyagraha is to start from today."

With respect to some demands you might hold that the Parliament is entitled, or the Government are entitled, to act according to the laws which have been framed by Parliament. But, with respect to other demands, which are directly the concern of Parliament, because in Manipur . . .

Mr. Speaker: I have heard him sufficiently. At this stage, all that I am interested in hearing is whether

this is a fit matter for an adjournment motion. I do not deny that hon. Members can come to this House with respect to matters that agitate the public mind like fixation of prices, uneconomic holdings etc. With regard to holdings, there was an Act passed by this House to which hon. Members were parties. Of course some hon. Members did not vote for it. But, all the same, there were legislations with respect to ceiling in Delhi, Manipur and Tripura. No, shall we modify them by way of an adjournment motion because some people are not satisfied? Therefore, all that I say at this stage is that these are not matters which can be disposed of by means of an adjournment motion. Therefore, I disallow this motion.

—
12.19 hrs.

RE: MOTION OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Speaker: Shri Khadilkar has given notice of a privilege motion.

Shri Khadilkar (Ahmednagar): Shall I have a say?

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow it. Let him resume his seat. We shall go by the rules. If I give my consent to the raising of the privilege motion, I shall ask the hon. Member to make a statement. If I refuse to give my consent there are two choices. If I refuse to give my consent and the hon. Member says that the order may be read out in the House, I will consider whether it may be read out. Since Shri Khadilkar is particular about it, I am going to read out the order of my refusal to give consent. That is strictly under the rules and he would not be given an opportunity to convince me here. The first proviso to rule 225(1) says:

“Provided that where the Speaker has refused his consent under rule 222 or is of opinion that the matter proposed to be discussed is not in order, he may, if he thinks it necessary, read the notice of question of privilege

and state that he refuses consent or holds that the notice of question of privilege is not in order.”

Now I am going to read out his notice of question of privilege and also the grounds on which I have refused consent. I am sure he will be satisfied with them. Shri Khadilkar has written to me:

“A friend of mine drew my attention to a speech delivered by Shri C. Rajagopalachari at Chandigarh on the 24th March.”

So, it is long ago.

“It has been reported in the leading English daily *The Indian Express* of the 26th March, 1960. The report says:

‘Mr. Rajagopalachari said that its (Congress) representatives in the legislatures were such people whom any first class magistrate would sound up.

An Hon. Member: Very true.

Mr. Speaker: “They were men without any appreciable means of livelihood.

Prima facie, it is a contempt of the House and therefore serious notice of it should be taken . . .”

An Hon. Member: That is quite true.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Why should there be a running commentary like this?

“. . . therefore serious notice of it should be taken at the earliest opportunity. The paper claims to have the largest combined net sales among all daily newspapers in India. It is published from several centres in the country.”
(*Interruption*).

Whatever be the language that might have been used, I will refer to two precedents. A similar question arose in the House of Commons, U.K., on the 21st June, 1954, when a Member, Sir H. Williams brought to the notice