

भी घटल बिहारी बाजरेबी : मैं ने कहा था कि पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी इम की जांच करे। क्या मंत्री महोदय को पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी में विश्वास नहीं है ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : पार्लियामेंट में भी एक विजिलेंस बिग बना दिया जाये।

12.59 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED ASSAULT ON SHRI K. MANOHARAN, M.P. AT MADRAS AIRPORT

MR. SPEAKER: Shri K. Manoharan. He has given notice of a Motion of Privilege.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN (Madras-North): Mr. Speaker, what I am going to say or read is a direct passionate appeal to the conscience of the member of this House (Interruptions). I request my hon. friend, Shri Piloo Mody, to have some patience. What I am going to say is from the bottom of my heart, with a mental anguish.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): I did not say anything.

13 hrs.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to bring to your notice an incident that took place at the Mennambakkam airport last evening when I was proceeding to emplane for Delhi for attending the Parliament session today. About 30 hooligans....**

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wavdi-wash): Sir, I rise on a point of order. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will call you after he finishes the statement.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: A point of order cannot wait for his finishing his statement. (Interruptions). The point of order cannot wait till he finishes his statement. (Interruptions)

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: May I proceed, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Just a minute. I think this point of order raised by Mr. Viswanathan has much weight in it. I would be very happy if you just mention the names of the people or the group of people, but to bring in certain names of certain dignitaries ... (Interruptions)

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: * *

He is a defector. He has defected from the DMK party.** He talks about conscience. He has sold his conscience.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been listening point of order?

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI (Dharamapuram): Sir, on a point of order. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I have been listening in this House to all the Members but then—(Interruptions).

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Till Monday last he was in the DMK.

MR. SPEAKER: When he is hurt, he has the right to bring it to this House as a Member.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Let him withdraw it. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I will look into it.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair, vide Col. No. 223.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: Let me finish it. I am glad that I have been for so many years with my good friends, and they had an opportunity to attack me behind my back for the past so many years. But now it has occurred to them to come out in the open and attack me. I must swallow it. Happily I swallow the bitter pill. *(Interruptions)* I can tell the names of the people. I can tell you. Panchaksharam; my friend Mr. Sezhiyan knows him; and R. C. Mathu; Mr. Sezhiyan knows him, perhaps I think Mr. Viswanathan may not know because he is a new entrant to the party. Now, about 30 hooligans**

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: On a point of order. I have to explain.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: I am not yielding.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: He need not yield.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Viswanathan, do not interrupt him. I will call you later.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: While the privileges of the Members should be protected, the same privileges should not be misused and abused like this, to drag the name of the Chief Minister--

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: * * Pounced upon me as soon as I alighted from the car in the portico of the airport. *(Interruptions)*. Two members of the gang strangled my throat, while some others went to the extent of getting hold of and squeezing my testicles. *(Interruptions)*. Mr. Speaker, the only disqualification from which I am suffering is I cannot speak untruth.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Here is the only Harischandra in this Parliament, because he has defected from the party.

MR. SPEAKER: We are all Harischandras unless otherwise proved.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: These were deliberate attempts pre-planned to physically liquidate me before I got into the plane for reaching Delhi. I can identify all these people.

It is well known that I have joined the ADMK and gave full support to that Party's struggle against corruption and undemocratic methods of the Tanjore Nadu Ministry led by Shri Karunanidhi. Shri Karunanidhi is using machinery as also rowdy gangs to liquidate those who oppose his misrule. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Are we going to allow this? There must be an end to this.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: Two days ago a gang of about 200 people marched on my house in Madras to terrorise me and prevent me from acting according to my conscience... *(Interruptions)*. One of the close friends of Shri Karunanidhi, viz., Shri Minor Moses, former Mayor of Madras came to my house with some rowdy elements one night and he terrorised me and said he would take away my life if I dare to oppose Shri Karunanidhi and join the ADMK... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: * * We cannot tolerate his non-sense going on in this House. He should not take advantage of this opportunity in this House. You have allowed him to move a privilege motion and he is making a political speech... *(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER: I allowed you only to mention the facts of the assault on you and the consequent obstruction caused to you. So far as your inter-party quarrels are concerned, I think you may leave them apart and confine yourself only to the assault. You are an experienced Member.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair, vide col. No. 223.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: (Kannur): I rise on a point of order. Some words have been used which you might not have heard; I do not know.** He should withdraw that or it should know.**

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: I shall remember Mr. S. M. Banerjee having called Mr. Humayun Kabir ** a renegade and.....(Interruptions).

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Did I not withdraw it? He knows it also..... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: That word is unparliamentary; that will not form part of the record. Now, please be brief and confine only to the incident; you are an experienced Member.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: What happened in the airport last evening is, according to me, only a culmination of these attempts against my life. I am unable to understand how these people were able to collect inside the portico of Meenambakkam airport without the knowledge of the police. It will not be far from truth if I presume that the police was deliberately conniving with the hooligans due to fear of the Chief Minister.**

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, a Jan Sangh Councillor in Delhi was beaten. Can he say that the Prime Minister sent a few persons to beat him? What is this? It is nothing but non-sense. He is maligning the name of the Chief Minister of a State who is not here to defend himself. It should be expunged. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Do not mention such things.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: I am concluding; I therefore request that the matter should be taken up by this House as a breach of privilege so that the Tamil Nadu police may be directed to give adequate protection to

Members of Parliament who are targets of attack by the ruling DMK partymen led by Shri Karunanidhi.

I thank you.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Shri E. R. KRISHNAN travelled in the same plane. He was present at the time of the incident. You can hear him also. He is also a member of the House. Can Mr. Manoharan exaggerate all the incidents?

MR. SPEAKER: Whenever a member is assaulted while on the way to attend the session of the House, we have been normally entrusting it to the Committee of Privileges.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): I would request you to maintain uniform standards in all cases. Sometime back in the case of Dr. Saradish Roy, he wrote to you also but no step was taken.

MR. SPEAKER: Let me make the position very clear. When a member is on his way to attend the session of the House there is a different procedure as compared to when the House is not in session.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: This shirt will show how I have been mau-handled by the police.

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI: He is a very good actor.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Let him act outside the House, not inside the House.

SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN (Salem): I happened to travel by flight No. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: I have not allowed you yet. Let me deal with this first. You can do it after the leave is granted or not granted.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): What I wish to emphasise is this. When a complaint of this nature is made, it must be made in a correct manner. It should be confined only to that particular matter. Here you are referring to all manner of people who are not members of this House. You attribute motives. You might say that hooligans attacked you. But can you say.** It is not proper. By all means it can be said that he was prevented by certain people from coming here, that he was assaulted. All these things can be said. I think the other portion should be deleted. It is for you to consider it.

SHRI JOYTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): As a Member of Parliament I wanted to address a meeting within my constituency. An attempt was made to annihilate me. When I wrote to you in the matter, that letter reached you after one month. Then there was a cock-and-bull story. In this case, has any reference been made to the Tamil Nadu Government or *suo motu* you are allowing it to be raised?

MR. SPEAKER: Normally, we have been very sympathetic on these questions. There is no controversy about it.

SHRI JOYTIRMOY BOSU: What was done in my case?

MR. SPEAKER: When Parliament is not in session there is no case of Member coming to attend the House. . . . (Interruptions). In such cases, we normally refer the matter to the Minister for information and the information supplied by the Minister is

placed before the House so that it can take a decision. There is no option for the Speaker in such cases. I have been following the normal practice. So, in this case also I leave it to the House for its leave.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the motion?

MR. SPEAKER: It is a motion of privilege.

SHRI SEZHIAN (Kumbakonam): Shri Basu made a reference to an attempt to assault him. Parliamentary activity need not be confined to attending the session. He can go to the constituency in the course of his parliamentary activities.

MR. SPEAKER: That you can consider and you can amend the rule. When a Member is obstructed on his way to attend the session of Parliament, it is taken as a breach of privilege. I am putting before the House the motion. He says "I want to move a motion of privilege on the assault made on me last evening at Meenambakkam airport." Then he has given a long explanatory letter.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior): Motion against whom?

MR. SPEAKER: He has mentioned it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Not in the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: He can add it. He has mentioned it in the explanatory letter sent to me.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated—Anglo-Indian): Sir, I have listened with pain to what is happening here. I am not holding a brief either for the ADMK or DMK. But, as Shri Patel was pleased to point out, on which you have not given a ruling, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The undesirable part will be deleted.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair, vide col. No. 223.
2417 LS-8.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Please hear me. Certain allegations of serious offences were made against** I want to know whether he is also to be indicated because you say all the names have been mentioned. Is he to be indicated? I was raising it as a matter of principle. Personally, I do not think this sort of allegations should have been permitted by you. Now you are saying you are allowing it. The motion refers to the main instigators also. I want to know whether you are allowing that. What is happening in this country?

MR. SPEAKER: I made it very clear in the beginning. I invited Shri Manoharan's attention to it and I told him that he should avoid it. Then, other hon. Member raised it, as he has raised it. I will have to delete that part. The main allegation is against the persons who actually did it. It will be seen later on as to how to proceed in this matter. It is for the House to decide.

Now, Mr. Manoharan, your privilege motion should be very specific..

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): On a point of order, Sir.

Although I have all my sympathy for our colleague, Mr. Manoharan, and for that matter for any Member—being assaulted or, in any way, being prevented from discharging his duties as a Member of Parliament, and, certainly, it is the duty and obligation of the House to protect him and to take up the matter, I want to draw your attention to one thing, and that is that in a hurry you should not create a precedent which may, in future, affect the propriety of this august House. In this connection, I want to draw your attention to the case of Shri Ajit Kumar Saha and some other friends..... (Interruptions). When he was assaulted and there was almost an attempt at murder, he brought the same kind of privilege

motion before the House. Unfortunately, at that time, the House did not show that much sympathy as he deserved as a Member of the House, irrespective of any party consideration.

From that stand point, I feel, in regard to the issue that has been raised by Mr. Manoharan—certainly, it deserves the attention of the House—you should not in a hurry create such a precedent to accept it immediately. In your wisdom, you have pointed out that in his statement, he has mentioned certain dignitaries of a State and those portions should be deleted. This House has the right to know which of the portions have been expunged and which portions have remained. After that, the House can take up the matter for proper disposal of the issue

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I want to say one thing I am not going into the merits of the case All I want to say is that a uniform standard should be applied whenever such cases are reported to the House. Previously, in Mr Ajit Kumar Saha's case He first got the police report and then took up the case here The same standard should be applied to this case also There should be a uniform standard to be applied in all such cases Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu also made a complaint and that case is still pending

MR. SPEAKER: It is for the House to decide

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Let us have full facts first Let us apply a uniform standard in all such cases. Let us judge a case as per uniform standard. That is the practice that has been followed hitherto by the House.

श्री सख्त बिहारी कलकेशी : आप तामिलनाडु सरकार का स्पष्टीकरण क्या है इसका पता लाने और इस मामले पर फिर विचार किया जा सकता है। लेकिन इस की सीधे प्रिविलेज कमेटी को संज्ञाने के

**Expunged as ordered by the chair.

में हूँ मैं नहीं हूँ। जब तक अभी तक की परम्परा यह है कि इन तरह के मामलों के बारे में सन्ध सत्कारों को लिखते रहे हैं, उन से तथ्यों का जानकारी लेते रहे हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इस मामले में कोई प्रचवाह करने की जरूरत नहीं है और इसका दूसरा पहलू यह है, आपने अभी कहा कि इस में मुख्य मंत्री के बारे में जो भी हवाला है वह निकाल दिया जायेगा, फिर मुझे लगता है कि यह प्रिविलेज मीशन कुछ प्राइवेट सिटिजेन्स के खिलाफ होगा। अगर वह मुख्य मंत्री के खिलाफ है तब तो बात दूसरी है। लेकिन अगर प्राइवेट सिटिजेन्स के खिलाफ है तो पुलिस ने उाको रोकना या नहीं रोकना, उन को क्यों इकट्ठा होने दिया गया, इसके बारे में राज्य सरकार से जानकारी प्राप्त करके कोई फैसला करना ज्यादा उचित होगा।

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: On a point of order. Mr. Sezhayan has just now mentioned that a uniform standard should be adopted. By that he has implied that uniform standard is not being adopted; that means, a double standard has been adopted. (*Interruptions*). Why is this discrimination? Is it because he is a big man and I am a small man? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM (Tiruchirappalli): On a point of order.

SHRI DINESH SINGH (Pratapgarh) rose—

MR. SPEAKER: Let me deal with the point of order that has already been raised.

We have been following, I must say, a practice. In the last House many matters came here. I have a number of them to quote. When I said that they might go to Government for report, the House went on opposing it, violently. (*Interruptions*). Not on one occasion, but on a number of occasions. They wanted it to be decided then and there; they asked me to put it then and there. Now there are two things. So far as I have knowledge of the procedure as laid down by May and others the question of privilege exists when a Member is obstructed from attending the meeting of the House. In other cases where assaults have taken place when the House is not in Session, normally there was no case of privilege....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What about Parliamentary Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: Same. Parliamentary Committee or House or any work connected with the performance of the duties of this House. In this case, Mr. Manoharan left last night and he alleges obstruction on the way. In other cases it happened when the House was not sitting. It is for you to decide. I can call a meeting.... (*Interruptions*). I will have to go through that, what made it a different case. I am sorry, I do not contradict it. But I know, Shri Ajit Kumar Sahas was shown everything; everything went with his knowledge so far as the House was concerned. In this case also it is not my ruling. I leave it to the House. But before that, I do not want to lay down anything which may be a different matter from the practice we have been following.... (*Interruptions*). Do not give it a definite shape of practice so that you are bound for ever. Some situation may arise which may be more serious and in which case you will say, 'just now'. So, please be careful about it. Do not

make a very definite rule. Let us be flexible on these matters. All that I can do is, we can postpone this, if you like. Mr Manoharan can bring it later on, or, if you want to oppose it, I have no option left. But I would still request you not to make it a rule. Leave it with some flexibility because in future certain urgent cases may arise where you need not always say, 'Send it to the Government concerned, send it to the officers concerned for making inquiries'. There is no question of one standard here and one standard there (Interruptions) It is not a question of doing it Not at all (Interruptions). Do I mean it? Do not take it personally I have nothing to say (Interruptions). Some MP may be going somewhere else (Interruptions) and may be involved in certain difficulties

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Not when you go to the night club, but when you perform the parliamentary duties

MR SPEAKER. In Mr Jyotirmoy Bosu's case they were going to address a Party meeting

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU No, Sir

MR SPEAKER: . . . or conference

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU. You have got a wrong impression.

MR SPEAKER: When you go to address public meetings, there are sometimes obstructions, but every obstruction is not brought to this House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: That is within my constituency.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Kindly write to the Tamil Nadu Government to find out the facts.

SEVERAL HON MEMBERS rose—

अध्यक्ष महोदय पत्रिका में जो जल्ते होते हैं, वहाँ कई झगड़े हो जाते हैं। जनसंघ, कांग्रेस बहुत दफा आपस में झगड़ पड़ते हैं और मीटिंग नहीं होने देते। क्या हर बात इस हाउस में आयेगी ?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU. Not so simple, Sir. An attempt was made on my life.

MR SPEAKER If that is an attempt made on you

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU When I was coming to Delhi

MR SPEAKER Here he was coming to attend the House

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU In my case you had decided that it should go to the West Bengal Government but in this case it is not necessary.

MR SPEAKER Your case is entirely different.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: (Serampore) No question of 'Gadbad'.

MR. SPEAKER: He was coming to the airport to take the plane to Delhi to attend the Parliament session.

मीटिंग में जो झगड़े हो जाते हैं उनका मनोहरन साहब के मामले में कैसे मुकाबला हो सकता है ?

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: In Assansol station, Shri Ajit Kumar Saha, a Member of this House, was detained and manhandled while he was coming to attend a Parliament-

ary Committee meeting. That case you referred to the West Bengal Government and when their report came, then only you referred it to the Privileges Committee. This case also you should treat in the same manner.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps, at that time the House was not sitting.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Strinagar): Unfortunately, the basic important question of the Member's privilege is being overlooked. Unfortunately, Mr Manoharan himself is responsible for this. Unfortunately, again, this is having political overtone . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: In Mr. Saha's case before you sent it to the Privileges Committee you wrote to the West Bengal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: What I am saying is, do not have a rule on it.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Why not?

MR. SPEAKER. I leave it to the House.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: Sir, I am a part of the House.

This House cannot be a party to a Party's internal squabbles that are going on in Tamil Nadu. But that does not mean that the privileges of a Member as a Member should be minimised. So, my friends on this side or on that side should not view the whole matter from the political ideology they profess. The basic question is that if a Member has been assaulted, I think this House could agree that proper action should be taken . . . (Interruptions). Unfortunately, the Congress Members on the other side are betraying unnecessarily their sympathy for a political ideology . . . (Interruptions). This is the half truth . . .

SHRI INDER J. MALHOTRA (Jammu): No, no . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: The Members of the DMK are unnecessarily protesting as to whether this matter should be referred to Privileges Committee. What I want this House to be impressed upon is this. This particular question should be viewed from the point of view of the Members' privilege. We should come to the point whether the Members' privilege has been breached or not. I want both sides not to show extra sympathy or deny necessary sympathy. This matter should be looked upon from this angle, whether a Members' privilege has been affected or not. Therefore, what I would submit is this. If you feel that this is a *prima facie* case, you can, in your own wisdom, refer it to the Privileges Committee. Therefore, why bring the question to the House? Once you bring the question here, then ideological and party issues come out.

You made a distinction between when the House is in session and when the House is not in session. I don't agree with this interpretation. The Member continues to be a Member when he is discharging his duties as a Member. He attends to the work of the Parliamentary Committee. He attends to that work when there is session or no session. If he is assaulted, then, it is a matter of breach of privilege. There is no doubt about it. It should go to the Privileges Committee. Sir, I will not use the word 'double standard', but I will use the word 'different standard'. Different standards were adopted in the case of Mr Halder and Mr. Saha. If you set up this precedent now I would welcome that, that is, that whenever any Member complains that he has been assaulted, that should be referred to the Privileges Committee. But I am going to be also assaulted very soon. (Interruptions). This must go to the Privileges Committee.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMEN- TARY AFFAIRS AND SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI RAJ BAHADUR): We have got three questions before us. It relates to the dignity of the Member of this House. Is it a case of assault and prevention of coming to attend the session of Parliament? There are certain matters which were referred to, which are purely internal matters of the particular party, with which we are not at all concerned. Certain precedents have been quoted; certain other precedents have been cited. What I would request is only this. Now, it is lunch time. You may kindly consider my request. Mr. Manoharan may also amend his motion properly and then we can take it up. My only plea is this that merely something being some kind of a precedent in the past should not be allowed to determine or to influence our judgement in the present case. That is all that I wish to say.

SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN: I happened to be in fight No. 440 ...

MR. SPEAKER: I am not allowing him. The term 'double standard' is such an abhorrent thing that even when the rules permit me and even when the rules give me the discretion, there also, I am afraid of this 'double standard'. After all, when the discretion is to be used, you have to take into consideration the situation as it exists and certain circumstances as they are today. Now, I should make it very clear that when a Member is obstructed in the performance of his duties, in service to this House, it is certainly a clear breach of privilege. Whether it is a Committee or in the case of the House makes no difference, that remains the same. But so far as the Member, as a political figure, is concerned, so far as his role as a political worker is concerned, it falls outside, I don't think it extends to Parliament. For Parliamentary Service, it does extend but not his political functions. We have to make a little demarcation over this.

SHRI PILOO MOTOY: Why?

MR. SPEAKER: That you can decide.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What you are saying is self-contradictory.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: I was being shadowed every time.

MR. SPEAKER: You establish a condition or you change the rule when political parties hold.....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: On a point of order, Sir. What you have said, if I may point out humbly, is contradictory in itself. We cannot be separated from politics. There is no Member in this House who can be separated from politics.

MR. SPEAKER: As regards the question of attending a public meeting or going to a public meeting organised by his party, I do not think that it is a Parliamentary duty.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What about constituency?

MR. SPEAKER: It is up to the Members later on to make a rule about it. But, so far, it does not exist either in May's Parliamentary procedure or anywhere else. If it is there, hon. Members can bring it to my notice.

AN HON. MEMBER: It exists now- here in the world.

MR. SPEAKER: The only question is whether when some thing happens while a Member is on his way to perform his duties or service to the House, we should fix for ever that whenever any motion of privilege comes, we should always refer it for the report or whether it should be left to the discretion of the Speaker. I leave it to the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: You can exercise your discretion.

MR. SPEAKER: If I use my discretion, I may use it sometimes for and sometimes against, and that should not be taken as double standard.

SHRI PILOO MODY: That was why on the last occasion I said that you may send it directly to the Privileges Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Let him lay down a standard, and I shall follow it. I shall not follow any standard; if the hon. Members lay down a standard, I shall follow it.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYA: You have already exercised your judgment....

SHRI PILOO MODY: On the last such occasion, I had made a suggestion that when a matter like this arises, the best thing for the House to do is to send the matter to the Privileges Committee, whether there is a privilege or not. We do not need to decide it, let the Privileges Committee look into it, prepare a preliminary report, send it back to the House and say whether there was privilege or there was no privilege. If there was no privilege, the matter can be dropped. If there was privilege, it can pursue it and it can investigate the case. That would save a lot of time of the House. It will save a lot of bitterness, and it would not be necessary for the Congress Party to reveal which side of the struggle they are on.

SHRI RAJ BAHADUR: There cannot be any blanket thing like that.

MR. SPEAKER: If whenever anything happens to a Member of Parliament outside, it should be raised here and it becomes a question of privilege, then there will be no end to such motions. He may have a little quarrel with any man in any small meeting; or he may go to his place or he may have any other obstruction or other difficulties of his own. So, one will have to make a clear-cut distinction about it. I can call a meeting of the Rules Committee, I can call a meeting of the General Purposes Committee; let hon. Members discuss it and lay down what should be done. But if they want me to exercise my discre-

tion, at least I shall have to exercise it and see whether he was in the performance of his service to the House or not. My direction will work.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: In Shri Sahā's case, you had sent the motion to the Government of West Bengal, and after ascertaining the facts, you were pleased to refer it to the Privileges Committee. I suggest that the same yard-stick may be adopted in other cases also. I suggest that this may be sent to the Government of Tamil Nadu for obtaining the views of the Government there... (*Interruptions*)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Who says 'No'? Let not my hon. friends forget one thing, Shri M. Karunanidhi is not the only Chief Minister. There are 17 Congress Chief Ministers....

SHRI SEZHIAN: Why should they say 'No'?....

SHRI PILOO MODY: They have utilised Shri M. Karunanidhi fully for four years, and now they have no use for him, and they can dispense with him.

SHRI R. S. PANDEY (Rajhandgaon): In this House, you are the only competent authority ...

MR. SPEAKER: I thank him very much, but I have to see whether I am competent or not.

So far as reference to people like the Chief Minister or others is concerned, I do not think you should bring it in your Motion. Your Motion should be very direct and factual....

AN HON. MEMBER: Purposeful.

MR. SPEAKER: It is for the Committee to decide. So far as this question is concerned, performance of his functions is not doubt service to the House. Rather than give a hasty decision, I will take this up tomorrow.