

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA : Sir
...(Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you ask me for permission to raise it in the Zero Hour?

Have you given me notice on this?
...(Interruptions)...

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Laloo cannot be brought under any law. He is above the law ... (Interruptions)...

He cannot be brought under any law.
...(Interruptions)...

(The Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

उपसभापति : आप सब बैठिए, प्लीज ।

श्री नरेश यादव : नरसिंह राव सरकार की बात करें । ... (व्यवधान) ... सौ सौ चूहे खा के बिल्ली हज को चली । ... (व्यवधान) ...

उपसभापति : अच्छा, अभी आप बिल्ली की बात नहीं करेंगे ।

Please sit down. Let the Papers be laid on the Table.

REPORTS OF THE DEPARTMENT-RELATED PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

DR. M. ARAM (Nominated)

Sir, I present a copy each (in English and Hindi) of the following Reports of the Department-related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Human Resource Development:

- (i) Fifty-third Report on the functioning of the National Institute of Ayurveda, Jaipur;
- (ii) Fifty-fourth Report on the functioning of the National Institute of Mental Health and Neuro Sciences, Bangalore; and
- (iii) Fifty-fifth Report on the functioning of the All India Institute of Speech and Hearing, Mysore.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that a telegram has been received from Shri Nabam Rebia stating that on account of the Statehood Day as well as local Nyokum festival celebration in his State he is unable to attend the House from the 20th February, 1997 to 6th March, 1997. He has, therefore, requested for the grant of leave of absence.

Does he have the permission of the House for remaining absent from the sittings of the House from the 20th February, 1997 to 6th March, 1997?

(No hon. Member dissented)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Permission to remain absent is granted.

... (व्यवधान) ... आप लोग अपनी बात जरा बंद करेंगे तो बेहतर रहेगा,

Because there are a few other things which are to be taken up श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी ।

श्री नरेश यादव : मैडम, मारग्रेट आल्वा जी ने बड़ा अच्छा सवाल रखा है । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि नरसिंह राव साहब का नाम आप बताएं पहले नंबर पर । ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्रीमती मारग्रेट आल्वा : ठीक है, लालू को दो नंबर में लगा दो । उनको दो नंबर में लगाकर चार्जशीट करें । ... (व्यवधान) ... जैसे नरसिंह राव जी को चार्जशीट किया है, उनको भी दो नंबर में लगाकर से चार्जशीट करें । ... (व्यवधान) ... वह ता आप करें । डरते क्यों हैं ? ... (व्यवधान) ...

उपसभापति : मारग्रेट जी, आपके लीडर खड़े हैं बोलने के लिए । प्लीज । ... (व्यवधान) ...

RE: GOVERNMENT'S COMMITMENT TO SWISS COURT REGARDING USE OF BOFORS PAPERS

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairperson, I want to draw the attention of the House to an important issue. Madam, You will recall that on Friday last some of the hon. Members of this House raised an issue in regard to placing on the Table of the House papers relating to investigation on Bofors which have been

received the Swiss authorities. We understand from the Press reports that the hon. Prime Minister had no objection to place these documents on the Table of the House if the Members of Parliament demand. Our demand was to place these papers after proper translation to English from Swiss with authentication by the Government. I do not know what the position of the Government is because we have not got any clarification nor information. However, we are reading many versions from newspapers. The Parliament is in session and this is a sensitive matter. It is agitating the minds of the people for almost a decade. A JPC also looked into the aspects and came to certain conclusions. It is a different matter whether people agree to the conclusions but it came to certain conclusions. When the box which contained Bofors papers was shown to the whole world with the glare of publicity it was projected that some hidden treasure had been discovered. Thereafter, we were told that the Bofors papers would be laid on the Table of the House. We are second to none in knowing the truth. I would not like to go into the details of the aspects but the fact remains that the Government of the day should explain its position. Even today in a newspaper I found that one of the important executives of the investigating agency has passed the buck on to the "political executive." Now it is for the Government to decide. Here, the Government means the Council of Ministers, the Cabinet. The words have been used in quotes. The Cabinet has to tell us whether there is any difficulty. Again from the newspapers we find that there has been some understanding between the two sovereign Governments, the Government of India and the Government of Switzerland. This is from the newspapers because we do not have any authoritative version from the spokesman of the Government as to what the position is.

If this piece of information is correct...

AN HON. MEMBER: An undertaking has been given.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: An undertaking, some sort of MOU has been signed. These are the types of reports we are having. I do not know whether these reports or

correct but, surely, as Members of Parliament, we have every right to know the position from the Government. I urge the Government to please explain the position. Please do not keep the people in the dark. We were informed, again through the newspapers, that certain persons are the beneficiaries.

Almost on daily basis we are informed. If there are beneficiaries, then, what action the administration is going to take to catch those and bring them to book, to produce before the court? Here again there is no authoritative interpretation or authoritative explanation from the spokesman of the Government. Therefore, Madam, through you, I would request the Government to explain: (a) what are the difficulties in laying these papers on the Table of the House? (b) if there are any, whether the Prime Minister was aware of the difficulties when he made some sort of commitment. Also, I would like to know whether the officials concerned had properly briefed the Prime Minister to the effect that he cannot make any commitment or he should not make any such commitment as there is some sort of internal obligation or a commitment which should not be violated. Was this piece of information made available to the Prime Minister when he made some sort of a commitment? Thirdly, Why is the CBI deliberately — I am using the word "deliberately" — leaking out piecemeal information just to lead the people to some sort of erroneous conclusions? It is common knowledge, Madam, that unless the whole process of investigation is over, nobody can come to conclusions on the basis of piecemeal information available. But, it is equally the responsibility of the investigating agency to stick to that norms. They cannot simply run with the hare and hunt with the hound by selective leakage, by giving half-baked information and half-baked truth. They cannot lead the people to some sort of erroneous conclusions particularly in a matter which the Parliament is seized of deliberated on this issue for umpteen hours, went into depth and examined classified documents and thereafter came to certain conclusion which are still agitating the minds of the people. Therefore, I would not like to enter into a long discussion at this stage. But the queries that I am raising are: (a) What

are the difficulties on the part of the Government to lay the papers on the Table of the House? Of course, they will have to be translated and authenticated because the Parliament cannot accept any sort of document from any individual or anybody, (b) If there are any difficulties, is the Government, and particularly the Prime Minister, aware of these difficulties? At one point of time, he gave some sort of explanation while on a flight that he had no problem in placing these documents on the Table of the House. I would also like to request you — ultimately it is for the Presiding Officer to decide; of course, the Government will have to agree, if we want to have some sort of a discussion — it should be a structured discussion and not casual references because in that case we do not get the views of the Government. If the issues raised by the Members of Parliament are not responded to by the administration, it does not lead us anywhere. The Parliament cannot discharge its functions in that manner. We raise some minor issues just to draw the attention of the Government with the hope that the Government will take note of them. But on a sensitive issue like this where different aspects are to be examined, are to be looked into, I would humbly request you to please consider, of course, in consultation with the Government, to have a structured discussion and fix a date for it. Of course, Members will give proper notices to raise it in the proper form. I thank you, Madam, for giving me this opportunity.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have started the discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Now this matter was raised the other day by Mr. Pranab Mukherjee and others. I do not know if they are discussing it in the other House also. I will convey the sentiments of the Members to the hon. Chairman and naturally to the Government. The Minister is here. He will convey it ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI S.B. CHAVAN (Maharashtra): The Law Minister is here. ... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will discuss it. ... (Interruptions)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): I agree with Mr. Pranab Mukherjee.

... (Interruptions)... I fully agree with Pranab Babu. ... (Interruptions)... The other day we had a full discussion. ... (Interruptions)... We all want that these papers should be laid on the Table of the House. ... (Interruptions)... If the Government for one reason or the other is not doing it, then it should explain its position. In any case, there has to be a statement from the Government. We cannot be kept in the dark on this issue. I also agree with Pranab Babu that there should be a structured discussion and there should not be stray remarks here and there. I am refraining from getting into the merits of it. But, there should be a proper discussion. ... (Interruptions)... It can be for a full day so that everybody in the House can have his say. ... (Interruptions)... As far as leakage of information is concerned, the CBI. ... (Interruptions)... other day I raised this issue when Shri Jethmalani spoke on 'scam.' I objected to it. And ultimately, a ruling of the House of Commons was discussed in that matter. Again, I am submitting to you that that ruling of the House of Commons clearly mentioned all these things i.e., a man who has known about ... (Interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no ruling of the House of Commons. You may not remember it correctly. I remember it correctly ... (Interruptions)... Just one second ... (Interruptions)... Just one second ... (Interruptions)... As long as Mr. Chaturvedi is not divulging any facts he knew as the C.A.G., I think there is no harm. But if he is going to tell something from the papers which are not supposed to be put on the Table of the House or facts which should not be spoken on the floor of the House which he knows as the C.A.G., then I will have a difficulty. If he is speaking as a Member of Parliament, not from his previous information, then he can speak ... (Interruptions)... Now, he is an elected Member ... (Interruptions)...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar): Madam, I am not objecting to Mr. Chaturvedi, as an hon. Member of this House. What I am trying to say is, we must create good conventions for the future generation. There are plenty of hon. Members in the B.J.P. and they can raise this issue. I have no objection and I do not want to create any hurdle in the discussion. I want that

we must create a good convention in the House ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Madam, Shri Chaturvedi is an experienced Member of this House. In the Bofors issue, as far as I know, he was an investigator ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): I was never there as an investigator ...*(Interruptions)*... I was C.A.G.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Yes, As a C.A.G. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: I had a different role as a C.A.G. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Let me finish. He has submitted a report to the Government and I believe the convention is like this : Whosoever is involved in a sort of investigation or has prepared any report, should not participate in a discussion on that matter because he will get two platforms to justify his logic. This is my submission. I want your ruling on this.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, I await your ruling. But I would like to submit, as the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, I performed my duties in submitting a report to the Parliament as was enjoined by the Constitution and it was for the hon. President to submit that report to the House which he did. There was no question of personal involvement of Chaturvedi. The Comptroller and Auditor General's office is a Constitutional office and I do not want to go into all those details ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Madam, I want your ruling on this issue ...*(Interruptions)*... I have a small submission.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Mr. Dasgupta, my name was called and you are supposed to follow me ...*(Interruptions)*... It is alright ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Just, last point ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: It is not you and me, but it has become a habit

...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Mr. Chaturvedi, I would like to mention my last point. As far as the C.B.I. is concerned, the norms should be adhered to. Whether the C.B.I. is exceeding the norms or operating withing the norms has to be established.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As suggested by Mr. Mukherjee to you and others, we are going to request the hon. Chairman and the Government to find time for a proper discussion. I feel, in the light of the other hon. Members who are going to speak on other subjects, it is better if you kindly make your comments briefly ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, I do not take more time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You make your comments briefly.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, Deputy Chairperson, it is unfortunate that the question of purchase of Howitzer Gun or in common parlance 'Bofors', somehow or the other, is creeping up in the public mind again and again. It has become in the public mind some kind of a maze, if I may say so, of deception, and the way institutions and individuals have subverted the democratic process. I do not want to go at this stage into the details of this matter.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Madam, I want to raise a point of order on this issue.

He should not speak on this issue ...*(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Karunakaran want to say something.

SHRI K. KARUNAKARAN (Kerala): The question before us is whether the Bofors papers should be placed before the House or not. This question would have to be decided by the Government. As far as we are concerned...

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, I have not finished. I do not know how the hon. Member, Mr. Karunakaran, got up.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Karunakaran, are you speaking on Mr. Ahluwalia's point of order?

SHRI K. KARUNAKARAN: No, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then kindly sit down. Let him finish.

चतुर्वेदी जी, आप ऐज़ ए मੈबर ऑफ पार्लियामेंट जो बोलना चाहते हैं वही बोलिए । जब इस पर डिस्कशन आएगा, तब डिसाइड करेंगे ।

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I do not want to go into the details of Bafors. All I want to say is that somehow or other, this sordid saga must come to a truthful end.

I am not going into the details of the JPC, etc. Nor am I going to divulge any facts which came to my notice during my tenure as the Comptroller and Auditor General. If there would be any reference at any point of time, it would only be to the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General which was submitted before this House, and to the letter which I wrote to the hon. Speaker at that point of time, a copy of which I had sent to the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha. I refrain from referring to this at this particular moment because the only question now is about the papers which have been obtained by the Government of India.

Now, I would like to know, in the first place, whether there was any understanding or any commitment at any point of time. Was that understanding or commitment really in 1990' or...

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): 1990

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Or, was it when the court really handed over the papers to our Ambassador and, subsequently, to the Director of the CBI? Secondly, I want to understand...

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: The BJP was supporting the Government.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: I do not know whether the BJP was supporting the Government or not because I was not here then a colleague of yours. (*Interruptions*) I am a reasonably literate person and I know what it is. Madam, the point is, there is a thousand-page testimony with the Committee in Sweden.

This Committee is equivalent to our Public Accounts Committee.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: PAC.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, I do not want to go into all details at this particular moment. There is an attempt to divert my attention. I want to say that in the Bofors case, there has been an effort all along that something or the other should be done at different levels by different persons, under different guises, whether in the court or outside or by selective leakage of information, so that the truth should never come out. We have been told that five accounts or four accounts...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chaturvedi, we are going to discuss it. You are going into the entire details now. Please confine yourself to the submission. Otherwise, you are not doing any justice to the other people who have raised this matter.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Madam, I would only like to know as to when these papers would be laid on the Table of the House because the Prime Minister had already given that kind of a statement outside.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA (Punjab): The Minister is ready.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: I also want to mention here that there had been different versions. Yesterday's 'Indian Express' said something about the difficulties. The CBI has also raised certain points. Now, there is a third version. It has been rightly pointed out by Mr. Pranab Mukherjee that there were different versions. The other version which has come out now, today, is that the Swiss Government and their representatives say that they have no particular objection and that it is for the Government, the Indian Government, to deal with the papers, according to the Indian law.

I do not want to go into all those details at this particular moment. My only submission is this. I joint with Mr. Pranab Mukherjee in the demand that a discussion should take place — a structured one—under rule 176.1 would also like to know as to when these papers would be placed on the Table of the House.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP): Madam, India and Switzerland are two sovereign states, and there was an agreement between these two sovereign states in February 1990. According to this agreement, some undertakings have been given by the Government of India to the Government of Switzerland. As per these undertakings, whatever information our country obtains from Switzerland, is to be used only for the purpose of investigation of the offences mentioned in the undertaking. Thereafter, we sent a letter rogatory to the courts in Switzerland. In that letter rogatory also once again these stipulated undertakings had to be reiterated. In pursuance of that, after a long process, a marathon exercise, a set of papers has been received.

Now, it is a fact that newspapers have been publishing different versions.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT). No.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: But why has the Prime Minister said that?

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Even if the Prime Minister had said that these papers would be laid on the Table of the House, what he meant is that they would be laid at an opportune time, not at any time. ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: This is the first session of Parliament after.... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Let me finish.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : सदर साहिबा, मुझे आपके जरिए से मिनिस्टर साहब से सिर्फ यह पूछना है...

उपसभापति : पहले मिनिस्टर साहब पूरा कर लें । जो सकता हैं, आपके पूछे बगैर ...*(व्यवधान)*

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : मुझे एक बात पुछनी हैं कि अंडरस्टैंडिंग गवर्नमेंट के बीच में थी या हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ से जो कोर्ट में रिप्रेजेंट कर रहे थे, उनके बीच में थी ।

श्री रामाकान्त डी. खलप : अंडरस्टैंडिंग दो गवर्नमेंट के बीच में थी । भारत सरकार और स्विटजरलैंड की सरकार के बीच अंडरस्टैंडिंग थी । ...*(व्यवधान)*

उपसभापति : आप सुन तो लीजिए ।

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Thereafter, we sent a letter rogatory.

इसके बारे में भी हमने उनको कहा कि इसका इस्तेमाल इनवैस्टीगेशन में ही किया जाएगा ।

The second part of the aspect that we have to note is that the process of investigation is on. Everybody here will agree that when the process of investigation is on, it is not prudent, it is not proper and it is also not legal to disclose a part of the information received because it would not be in the interest of the accused ... *(Interruptions)* ... or in the interest of the prosecution to reveal whatever information we have at present. ... *(Interruptions)*

Therefore, this is not the time.

SHRI AJIT PK. JOGI (Madhya Pradesh): That is precisely what you have been doing.

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: We have not been doing it.

... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI: You are leaking out the information. ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Please listen to me.

SHRI AJIT PK. JOGI: If it is detrimental to the investigation, why are you disclosing it?

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: I charge that you are blackmailing the party which is supporting you. You want to do only that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Chaturvedi, please sit down. Just a minute.

I have sensed the mood of the House the other day and today that everybody is interested to know the whole detail.

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Exactly.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Minister is giving the legal information. He is the Law Minister. Let him put the legal position. ... *(Interruptions)*

I am interested in knowing what he says. Let him finish it. Let me hear what he says. Then I can give *(Interruptions)*

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN (Uttar Pradesh): He is only trying to protect some people.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me hear whatever he is trying to do. Until and unless I

hear him, I cannot say what he is doing. ...
(*Interruptions*)

Look, Sikander Bakhtji, I cannot understand it till I hear what the Minister wants to say.

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Madam, the time has not come to lay the papers on the Table of the House. ...
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN: What is the time, according to you?

श्री रमाकान्त डी. खलप : मुझे एक मिनट बोलने का मौका तो दीजिए साहब ।

The time has not come to lay the papers on the Table of the House. मुझे बोलने का मौका दीजिए ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let him finish. I think this is not fair. I am not happy with the way you people are questioning him. I am sorry. You people should listen to him first and then put a question. You have not heard him. You are putting questions to him before he has said anything. Please let him finish it. ... (*Interruptions*)

Please sit down. When you ask the Minister to react, let him react. Otherwise, I will ask him to go because you are not listening to him.

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: Madam, the investigation is on. Some more investigation is still going on in the Swiss courts. We have to obtain some more papers from the Swiss courts. If today we violate the undertaking that we have given there, we fear that the Swiss Court will go back and will not disclose any further information. In addition, there are many more offences which are being investigated. For example, the urea scandal case. We need information regarding that also from the Swiss authorities. There are many more cases where we need the assistance and cooperation of other foreign countries. If today we go back on the solemn undertaking that we have given and disclose everything by placing the information of the Table of the House, our image in the comity of nations will badly suffer. Moreover, we shall be offending the very principle of investigation. We shall be prejudicing the rights of the accused, who are being named in this case. We shall also be prejudicing the investigation process. So, we cannot do this.

The Government is, of course, prepared to discuss this issue with the leaders of various political parties. We have already said in the Lok Sabha that the Government is prepared to talk on this issue. The hon. Speaker of the Lok Sabha and the hon. Chairman of this House also have been requested to convene a meeting today or tomorrow as per their convenience. Where the leaders of various political parties will be invited and they will be explained the constraints that the Government faces in this regard. We do not want to hide anything or create any suspicion about any one. Therefore, please try to understand this very important issue. The interest of the nation is involved in this case; the dignity and the esteem of the country is involved in this case and the prospect of further investigation is involved in this case. So, kindly cooperate. I request the hon. Members to take up this issue today or tomorrow in the meeting that I have referred to. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Madam, this media trial and this rumour trial has been going on. Everyday they are planting stories in newspapers. (*Interruptions*) That gun was selected for hoot and shoot. Now they are doing a hoot of the shoot. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: They are planting stories in the press to bluff everybody (*Interruptions*) Who planted such stories? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: They are hooting through it. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP: We are not planting any stories, please.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Why did the CBI disclose names? What was the purpose? If you have not completed the investigation, why are you playing this game? They have not even translated the entire document in English and they are disclosing the facts and figures to the newspapers.

प्रो. विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा : आप अपने अण्डर टेकिंग में देखिए ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa): If this is the statement of the Government, how could the Prime Minister make statement outside the House? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: If this is so, why did they not brief their constituents not to brief the Press? (Interruptions)

विपक्ष के नेता (श्री सिकन्दर बख्त) : सदर साहिब, मुझे सिर्फ इतना कहना है कि अगर आनरेबुल मिनिस्टर को आखिर में यह बताना था कि चेयरमैन साहब और स्पीकर साहब मुख्तलिफ पालिटिकल पार्टीज के लीडर्स के साथ बैठकर बात करेंगे तो उनको इतनी बात कहकर अपनी बात खत्म कर देनी चाहिए थी, उनको दुनिया भर के एरियाज कैंवर नहीं करने चाहिए थे। यह निहायत आब्जेक्शनेबिल है। उनको इतनी बात कहकर खत्म करनी चाहिए थी। इतने सारे भषण की क्या जरूरत थी? आप मुझे क्षमा करेंगी। आपको वे चीजें जो कि सख्त काबिले एतराज हैं उनका जिक्र उस मीटिंग से पहले करने की जरूरत नहीं थी। यह बात क्या हुई?

† شری سکندر بخت: صدر صاحب۔ مجھے صرف اتنا

کہنا ہے کہ اگر آنریبل منسٹر کو آخر میں یہ بتانا تھا کہ چیئر

مین صاحب اور اسپیکر صاحب مختلف پالیٹیکل پارٹیز

کے لیڈرس کے ساتھ میٹنگ بات کرینگے تو انکو اتنی بات کہہ کر

اپنی بات ختم کر دینی چاہیئے تھی، انکو دنیا بھر کے ایریاز

کو نہیں کرنے چاہیئے تھے۔ یہ نہایت آجیکشنیبل ہے۔ انکو

اتنی بات کہہ کر ختم کرنی چاہیئے تھی۔ اتنے سارے ہماشن کی

کیا ضرورت تھی؟ آپ مجھے شما کریں گے۔ آپکی وہ چیزیں

جو کی سخت قابیل اعتراض ہیں ان کا ذکر اس میٹنگ سے

پہلے کرنے کی ضرورت نہیں تھی۔ یہ بات کیا ہوئی؟

उपसभापति : अब आइन्दा से नहीं करेंगे। अब हम लोग दूसरी जगह जाए न। लेट अस गो टू श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता।

RE. NEED FOR C.B.I. INQUIRY INTO SARLA MISHRA SUICIDE CASE IN BHOPAL

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता (मध्य प्रदेश) : मैडम चेयर पर्सन, आपका बहुत धन्यवाद। बड़े दुख के साथ इस

†Translation in Arabic script.

हाउस में, मैं एक दुखद घटना का उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ। अभी तक आपने महिलाओं पर अत्याचारों की अनेकों कहानियां सुनी हैं महिलाओं से छेड़छाड़, चैन खींचना, अपहरण, बलात्कार आदि लेकिन इससे भी ज्यादा वीभत्स जो घटनाएं हैं, वे मध्य प्रदेश में हो रही हैं। जिस कांड का मैं उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ वह कुमारी सरला मिश्रा कांड है। मैं जब कुमारी सरला मिश्रा का उल्लेख करूंगा तो मैं किसी मिनिस्टर को, किसी नेता को, किसी व्यक्ति को बदनाम नहीं करना चाहता लेकिन ...**(व्यवधान)**... आप सुन लीजिए। जो बात आपको उठानी चाहिए थी। ...**(व्यवधान)**... देखिए अभी तक जो हुआ है, आप कृपा करके मुझे बोलने दीजिए। आपको कोई परेशानी नहीं होनी चाहिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... कुमारी सरला मिश्रा जो कि कांग्रेस की बहुत पुरानी नेत्री थी। कुमारी सरला मिश्रा अविवाहित थी। ये जो घटना घटी है ...**(व्यवधान)**

उपसभापति : वे यह कह रहे हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता : मैडम, मुझे अगर बोलने नहीं दिया जायेगा तो मैं अपना टाइम ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्रीमती मारग्रेट आल्वा : मैडम, बीजेपी को अपनी कोई ...**(व्यवधान)** यहां कुछ नहीं होता है ...**(व्यवधान)**... अलवर में क्या हुआ ?

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता : मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ। ...**(व्यवधान)** मैं समझ नहीं पा रहा हूँ। मैडम जरा सुन लीजिये यह कोई तरीका नहीं है। मैं जीरों आवर में खड़ा हुआ हूँ आप मुझे जरा भी नहीं बोलने दे रही हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री : बंगला में एक कहावत है — ठाकुर घरे के आमि तो कला खाइसि अर्थात् पूजाघर में कोई खट-खट कर रहा था तो मां ने पूछा कि कौन पूजाघर में हैं ? जो लड़का केला खा रहा था वह जोर से बोला कि मैंने केला नहीं खाया, मैंने केला नहीं खाया। ...**(व्यवधान)** ये कुमारी सरला मिश्रा के बारे में बोल रहे हैं, आपत्ति उनको हो रही है। यह क्या बात है ? ...**(व्यवधान)** यह तो चोर की दाढ़ी में तिनके वाली बात है। इसमें आपके द्वारा आपत्ति करने की क्या बात है ? ...**(व्यवधान)**

श्री एस.एस.अहलुवालिया : शास्त्री जी, वह ऐसे हैं कि जैसे ही लड़के से टीचर ने पूछा कि धनुष किसने उठाया था तो वह बोला मैंने नहीं उठाया था। तो आपने यही बोला था ना। ...**(व्यवधान)**

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Madam Deputy Chairman, I am just saying that I have no objection to the hon. Member raising this issue. I am glad that the hon. Member is raising this question on a woman's suicide. He may talk about a woman's