

which, if enacted, would have adverse implications for our bilateral relations with the United States."

This is a more categorical statement of the views and feelings of the Government and the Parliament of India and more than that cannot be made in the Parliament at this time. And if the United States Administration is able to have these portions deleted then our efforts would have succeeded. If, however, these portions are deleted in a manner, not wholly satisfactory, then some measure of success would have been obtained. But if they stand as it is then the relations with the United States and India must be adversely affected. So, it is our sincere hope that the US Administration will carefully look at what we have said and will carefully go through the deliberations of this House today. I am to make a statement in the other House also. The message will go clear that there was a unanimous feeling in the Parliament of India that what the United States was doing in this regard by equating the nuclear programmes was unjust, unfair and unalloyed for.

I would like to once again thank hon. Members for the manner in which they have spoken. Responsible, statesmanlike manner and the high standard of this debate strengthens Government's efforts to have this legislation altered. Thank you, Madam.

Reported Remarks of Home Minister, Shri Buta Singh, against Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh—Contd.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we take up further discussion on the matter raised with permission.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I have the privilege of speaking immediately after Advani Ji and I am particularly grateful for that opportunity because out of our great respect for him personally and for whatever views that he expressed, I would like to say that all of us in the House are in agreement with him, upon the sentiments that he expressed, about certain standards that are expected of

political leaders especially in their utterances about other political leaders. I also agree with great respect that it is totally wrong and irresponsible—I think that is what he said—for any political leader to call a Chief Minister anti-national or to say that he advocated casteist feelings and communalism. Such a leader suffers from a certain lack of responsibility. That is what Advani Ji said. But I want to point out whether this be true or not, whether I disagree with it or not, whether what the hon. Home Minister said was true or not or whether he was properly quoted or not, that the fact remains that time and again in this House, in various public fora, at election meetings and in various important places, even as important a place as the Opposition convention at Surajkund, they had called the Prime Minister in far worse terms. Advani Ji had said that six crore people of Andhra have elected Mr. Rama Rao. I say that 800 million Indians have elected the Prime Minister. They called him far worse names. I am not going to read it because it is a disgusting slur. (Interruptions)

The Vice Chairman (Shri Jagesh Desai) in the Chair]

They have called him far worse names. I am not going to read them because they are disgusting slur upon the highest office in the land, upon the Prime Minister. If anybody wishes, I can read straightaway from the paper and they can see it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, please.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: No, I am not going to read it, but the fact remains that they called him far worse than anti-national. They called him far worse names. It is not only Mr. Rama Rao himself, but Mr. Devi Lal also. They accused him of bartering away the integrity of the nation. They accused him of terrible things. Therefore, assuming without admitting any lack of responsibility, I charge leaders of all Opposition leaders of a far greater lack of

[Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan]

responsibility by their public utterances and public statements that time and again they have repeatedly made. Even though they have done this at every stage when for the first time we get up here everybody is up in arms. Not once have they gone back. If you just go through the folder that I have got here the kind of names that they have called the Congress party—every single objection that Advaniji has raised—what has been said about Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister—far worse things have been said about our Prime Minister and that again is a matter of national scheme. Let them examine their conscience before they come here and talk about high sounding notions and about political responsibility and what are the kind of responsible statements that political leaders are to make.

Sir, much water has flowed under the bridge. Many things have been said. It will be my endeavour to make an uninterrupted speech. Therefore, I am not going to refer to those allegations once again. I just want to make one very important observation. I associate myself with this motion not only because of the lofty concept of maintaining good Centre-State relations which is no doubt an ideal to which all of us should work for, but I want to remind this House of one more concept, that is, good relations between the executive and the judiciary and between the legislature and the judiciary. This is a principle of our Parliamentary democracy. This is a basis upon which democracy rests. Why is this principle of separation of powers? I know why the Members of the Telugu Desam party are so sensitive about the judiciary when every time a judgement is given. In fact, the Chief Minister has gone on record, if I am not mistaken, as saying that there are about 39 or 49 adverse judgements against the Chief Minister. Every time there is an adverse judgement against the Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister he immediately characterises it.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:

Not against the Chief Minister, against the Government you can say.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I stand corrected. Against the Government headed by the Chief Minister, Mr. N. T. Rama Rao. He immediately characterised it as a verdict against 6 crore Andhra people. I do not think how that follows. Every time there is an adverse judgement against the Government obviously they say it is against 6 crore Andhra people. So with regard to this judgement also which is none the less a judgement, the Telugu Desam party has gone on record saying that this judgement is going to upset the delicate balance between the judiciary and the executive. I fail to understand how this can upset if a judgement is wrong. (Interruptions) I am not yielding.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:
Just one minute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): What wrong she has said? Let the debate go smoothly. She has avoided referring to anything.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I am not criticising. Apparently the hon. Member is relying on a resolution passed by the Telugu Desam Parliamentary party which is obviously what she has in her mind. We have not criticised the judgement there. We only referred to the Congress party's tactics to resort to High Court instead of political battle and they are having recourse to political litigations. That is what we have said.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: High Court does not belong to any political party.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I do not think that the hon. leader of the Telugu Desam party has exactly clarified matters. In fact, he is really reinforcing what I am saying. Still whatever the Congress is doing or not doing, the fact remains that they have said that this judgement is going to upset the delicate balance between the judiciary and the executive, no matter whose hand is behind it. This is what they have gone on record as saying. This is a matter

that truly shocks the national conscience. Every time a judgement goes against a particular Government you climb on an official resolution of a parliamentary party and say that this judgement is going to upset the delicate balance between the judiciary...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:
This is not correct.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Somebody can correct it. *(Interruptions)* This is what her interpretation is.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: If this is allowed to go on....
(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: How can you go on record like this?

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: If this is allowed to go on, there will be nothing but anarchy. It is not even a question of Centre-States relations but the entire relations, the precious relations, the sacred relations among the judiciary, the executive and the legislature will completely break down and we will have nothing but anarchy all over the country. Therefore, this is a dangerous precedent. I think it is incumbent upon the party and the Government to accept a decision and an observation of the High Court with good grace and then try to meet it squarely. If they think the judgement is wrong, it would much better for them to go in appeal against that judgment to the Supreme Court without casting unnecessary slurs against the judiciary particularly the Chief Justice.

Sir, another point I wish to make is that we all know that the hon. Home Minister went there in his personal capacity to campaign for elections. He is the same person. He cannot separate himself and go, half of him saying 'I am not the Home Minister'. He went there in a personal capacity and he went there to campaign for elections and my hon. colleagues who have spoken before me have already said

and I do not want to repeat, that a person who goes for election campaigning is not exactly going to sing the praises of Mr. N. T. Rama Rao, campaigning is not exactly going to sing his praises for a minute. Therefore, he went there.. *(Interruptions)* I know what Mr. N. T. Rama Rao said in Nagaland.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You do not hear the interruptions. You go ahead.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, in Nagaland, Mr. N.T. Rama Rao made the most wonderful speech of all where he said and he has gone on record as having said .. *(Interruptions)* ... that Naga nationalism is not anti-India. If this is not anti-India and not patriotic on the part of the Chief Minister to say, I do not know what sentiments are anti-national. *(Interruption)*.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You cannot say like that. Please sit down.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Nothing will go on record. I am standing on my legs. Please don't speak

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I reiterate it; I stand by it. I reiterate the fact that what Mr. N.T. Rama Rao said during the campaigning in Nagaland is an anti-national statement and I stand by it. Let them deny that statement if they can. I do not say anybody standing up there and denying that fact that Mr. Rama Rao made a statement like that *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please sit down. If a statement is wrong, somebody will correct it from your side. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: *

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Sir, we will try to be very chivalrous. We are not going to contradict every single thing which she is saying. A lot of it is *. That is why, we are not going to talk about this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): This will not go on record.

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI: Sir, I only request through you that a friend and a fair lady Shrimati Renuka in Mythology is a very sober lady. She is not a Chandra. She should be sober.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): She is sober. Sit down, please.

श्रीमती रेणुक चौधरी : अ पके लिए तो मैं उठती हूँगी । . . मैं तो फट हूँ

Dr. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: I am on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): What is the point of order?

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: The Chief Minister is not here and she says that the Chief Minister is anti-national. It is contempt. (Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please, sit down. Sit down Mrs. Renuka Chowdhury. (Interruptions) The interruptions will not go on record. Please, go on Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Mr. Rama Rao is (Interruptions)

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: *

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: *

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: They do not want to hear the truth.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: *

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You please go ahead Mrs. Jayanthi Natarajan. (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: *

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: *

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: They talk anything about democracy ... (Interruptions)

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Punjab): Mr. Upendra used the word* That is unparliamentary. (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I have already said that it will not go on record.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): With your permission, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to make this point of clarification.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Yes.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: I do not think that when she says that a particular statement is anti-national, she means that the person is anti-national. That is not a necessary corollary. I entirely agree with her that she might consider a particular statement of any person as anti-patriotic or anti-national. There is a perception in our country, as in many other countries, that certain States are multi-national. For instance, India is one country, but there are several States. There are nationalities in the country. For example, I am proud of being an Indian. I am equally proud that I am a Bengali. Will that position be considered to be anti-national? I want a clarification from her.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): She is not bound to clarify.

*Not recorded.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: The small difference between my perception and that of the hon. Member, Mr. Chatterjee, is ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: It is a Constitutional point. (*Interruptions*). The citizenship of a country. (*Interruptions*) Let us be very clear. About the citizenship of this country, There cannot be any question. It has been defined in the constitution. Indian Citizenship is indivisible. You can belong to any State, any Pradesh. That does not matter. You are an Indian. That is the question, Nationalism is not divided. . .

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: There is no word called 'nationalism' in our Constitution.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: We have one nation one citizenship, one flag

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): India is a multinational State; it is a multinational India.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Nationalism is one and that is Indian.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: India is a multinational State.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: I am sure Mr. Advani does not hold this view.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I don't agree with it.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It is better to be multinational than to be a bonded labour of the Congress.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: We are Indians first, not Dravidians.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: We are Dravidians first and then Indians.

SHRIMATI JAYANTI NATARAJAN: I still maintain and I want to reiterate the question of being a Tamilian or a Bengali or a Punjabi is not material here. As you have rightly pointed out, we are all Indians. But that is a different issue altogether. The point is that the statement that

I am talking about of the honourable Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh saying 'Naga nationalism' as if Naga nationalism is not Indian, is appalling to me . . .

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Where did he said that? I went to with the Chief Minister to Nagaland. Where did you get the sentence from? I was with the Chief Minister. He never said any such thing.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: May I interrupt a minute? Mr. Vice-Chairman, a very important issue has come up on which, I am quite sure, Mr. Buta Singh and his colleague and everyone else there knows my strong views. Therefore, I would like to make it clear that if, for instance, the Home Minister had criticised the Chief Minister of Andhra on the ground that the Chief Minister of Andhra had been propounding the concept of a multinational State, that India is a multinational State, I would have endorsed his point of view. I would have said I entirely agree with the Home minister. But the report before me tell me... (*Interruption*) I am talking for myself and I do believe that when the Constitution-makers of India framed this Constitution, the entire thinking was based on the concept that India may be multilingual, that India may be multi-ethnic that India may be multi-religious, but that India is one nation. But I took objection to the fact that the Home Minister says, "Why should he go to Nagaland? He does not have a party there."...

SHRI BUTA SINGH: No, no.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: You see the report. She is quoting from someone else. I do not know what she is quoting from. The report is with me. This is the report ... (*Interruptions*) ... What I am saying is that my objection is to this. I am objecting to this and I take my friend, Shri Upendra's words that Mr. N. T. Rama Rao did not say anything of the kind that has been referred to here.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: You believe in whatever you want to ... (*Interruption*).

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I take objection to this, to what I am having in my hand. You reply to this.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He can reply to that.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Let the Home Minister speak out Advaniji, you are such a respected leader. You agree with what the Home Minister says and not what Mr. Gopalsamy or somebody else says. *(Interruptions)* ..

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Kulkarni, I need not agree with his views ... *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, another point that was made during the various interventions was that the honourable Home Minister had to go through the Zilla Parishad elections are entirely an affair of the State. I just want to remind the House of another incident in 1978. At the time, the Government in power at the Centre was the Government in which Advaniji himself was a member—he was a member of the Cabinet—and during the Zilla Parishad election in Karnataka, though the State Government was perfectly capable of handling the elections, Shri Mandal, the then Minister of State for Home Affairs, was sent there by the Central Government to look after personally the elections over there

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It was not a Zilla Parishad election, but it was a Parliamentary election.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Why do you want to reply? Somebody from this side can reply to that point because there are so many speakers still to speak.

SHRIMATI JAYANTI NATARAJAN: Sir, I am perfectly aware of the difference between a Zilla Parishad election and a Parliamentary election. But the fact remains that law and order is equally maintained by the State Government during these elections also and the State Government is supposed to be responsible for

maintaining law and order there. And, Sir, without the consent of or any request from the Government in power in Karnataka, they deployed the Central Reserve Police Force there during those elections and now they are getting up here and saying that the honourable Home Minister goes in his personal capacity to campaign in the election. This is wrong. I, therefore see the double standards that are applied and I just want to remind the honourable House of this fact.

Then, Sir, about patriotism; I just want to make one point. Sir, it has come to my notice that a charge-sheet has been filed and served on a very senior IAS officer in the Andhra Pradesh Government and the charges that have been levelled against him... *(Interruptions)* ... Sir, if I am wrong, I will immediately withdraw those words because this is a matter which is capable of verification easily, and I say so with the greatest responsibility ... *(Interruptions)* that a senior IAS officer in Andhra Pradesh Government has been charged with involvement with a prominent forum of social action involving people from all walks of life for social reconstruction to tackle rising unemployment and he has been charged that he was involved in the setting up of a socio-economic action force with the object of preserving national integrity, removing casteism, communalism, regionalism and linguistic chauvinism and that he was involved with the Bharat Sena intended to safeguard the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution, to create a caste-free society and with appealing to the people to support and strengthen the forum ... *(Interruptions)* ... This is the charge-sheet ... *(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Let her mention the name. What is the name?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): She has already said that she is prepared to withdraw if it is wrong and she has also said that she is saying this with the greatest sense of responsibility.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I have already said that I will withdraw the words if I am wrong. Therefore, I say *(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: I do not know who gave her all these things

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAG-ESH DESAI): You see, she is a responsible Member of this House

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY: She is making irresponsible statements. . . *(Interruptions)* ...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN. So much about the patriotism of the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh and about what the honourable Home Minister said in his election speech about the judgement. Then, Sir, about allegations of corruption; We have argued at length. . . *(Interruptions)* ... We have argued at length *(Interruptions)* ... We have argued at length about whether the observations made were in the judgement or not. We spent almost one day arguing whether what the honourable leader of Telugu Desam called the allegations of the petitioner were a part of the judgement or not I won't go into all that. I want only to remind the House of a very important fact all of us forgot. There were four petitions filed—one for a quo-warranto and another for imposing President's rule in the State. Both these petitions were dismissed. But two writ petitions, one asking the Central Government to start prosecution for FERA and Income-tax violations, and another calling upon the Central Government to appoint a Commission of Inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act—these two writ petitions have been admitted, and they are pending, and in the operative portion of the judgement of His Lordships, Justice Anjaneyulu says:

"The above allegations, which are merely illustrative and are not exhaustive, give an account of some of the serious allegations made against the first respondent. It is not possible to know at this stage whether these allegations are true or not, because the first respondent in the affidavit filed by him did not choose to deny the allegations. He only

characterized them as frivolous, scandalous and ill-merited."

(Interruptions)

Why don't you listen? I am sorry I can't help your comprehension. I have better knowledge than you have

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAG-ESH DESAI): You please look at me and speak. Please go ahead.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: You must protect me from them also. I am not saying anything unparliamentary

So he characterized them as "frivolous, scandalous and ill-merited." Then he says:

"The counter-affidavit must have been drafted by expert legal advisers of the first respondent and it is not as if the first respondent omitted to deny these allegations by accident."

Now, this is not from the petitioners' side or the Member of the Congress Party who filed the petition. This is the finding. It is not as if ...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I said in the morning that at that stage he did not file the counter affidavit on the allegations. The question of the jurisdiction of the court to consider the petition was questioned... *(Interruptions)*

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Their Lordships said:

"We had to go through this exercise at considerable personal inconvenience because we are conscious that unless a rule nisi should not be issued in these writ petitions unless a strong *prima facie* case is made out."

They thus are of the opinion that this is a very important matter. After that, Sir, very significantly, they immediately admitted the two writ petitions and they posted them for hearing. The ultimate decision of the court is something we all know.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: The matter is *sub judice*. And she tells that unless there are valid groups. . . *(Interruptions)* A lawyer should not say that, *(Interruptions)* The hearing has not started. She cannot put words in the mouth of the Judges. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAG-ESH DESAI): I am hearing each and every word very carefully. (Interruptions)

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: You may be hearing the whole thing very carefully. But at the same time you allow the Member to say that only after having considered the whole thing it must have been admitted. (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAG-ESH DESAI): She said that there was a *prima facie* case because they have admitted it. It is quite in order.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: On final word, Just one more sentence. He said that the hon Home Minister called upon the people to destabilise the Andhra Pradesh Government. I tried to interrupt at that time. But the tempers were running high and I could not make myself heard. You can check the record. He actually misquoted even their own press reports when he said that the Home Minister had said that the Government would be overthrown. What actually happened was that he called upon the people of Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I did not say that. You can see the record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAG-ESH DESAI): It is on record and he will deal with it.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It is on record as my charge against the Home Minister. I said that this is an indication of the Centre's effort to destabilise the Andhra Pradesh Government.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: That is what he said. I accept it. My point is this. All that the hon Home Minister did was to call upon the people of Andhra Pradesh to wake up to the misdeeds of the Telgu Desam Government headed by Mr. N. T. Rama Rao. He called upon the people of Guntur to throw him out. Sir, if I may say so, they have convincingly thrown him out.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, केन्द्रीय गृह मंत्री माननीय बृट्. सिंह जी द्वारा एक दिसम्बर, 1987

को गूटूर. आन्ध्र प्रदेश में दिए गए भाषण पर जो चर्चा हो रही है....

श्री बृट्. सिंह : कथित भाषण....

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : जो 2 दिसम्बर, 1987 को न्यूजटाइम में प्रकाशित हुआ है उस पर उठे विवाद पर माननीय सदन के माननीय चैयरमैन महोदय ने श्री उपेन्द्र जी को विशेष उल्लेख का अवसर प्रदान किया था। मुझे इस बात का दुख है कि सरकारी पक्ष की ओर से उस विशेष उल्लेख के ऊपर तो कुछ भी नहीं कहा गया लेकिन मुख्य मंत्री के ऊपर जो तीन-चार रिटें आन्ध्र प्रदेश के हाई कोर्टों में उठाई गई हैं, उन रिट पिटीशंस में दिए गए ऐलिगेशंस की निरंतर चर्चा रही। मेरे माननीय सदस्य जो मेरे बराबर बैठते हैं और पीछे बैठते हैं उन्होंने लगातार ही उन ऐलिगेशंस को जो कि पिटीशंस में दिए गए हैं पढ़कर दोहराया। मैं भी कहता रहा कि आपरेटिव पार्ट आफ दि जजमेंट क्या है उसको बताइए। लेकिन वे ऐलिगेशंस पढ़ते रहे और नतीजा क्या हुआ कि उन चार में से दो रिट पिटीशंस तो हाई कोर्ट ने रद्द कर दी, बाकी दो की ऐलिगेशंस वे बराबर पढ़ते रहे सुनाते रहे।

श्री राम अश्वघोष सिंह : समय काटने के लिए इनके पास दूसरा कोई चारा नहीं था। (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष : (श्री जगेश देसाई) : मैं भी यहां पर मौजूद था ऐसा आप मत कहिए.... (व्यवधान)
5-00 P.M.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : मान्यवर, जो 2 दिसम्बर को यह समाचार प्रकाशित हुआ है, अगर यह सही नहीं है तो गृह मंत्री महोदय को 2 को ही रात को इसका खंडन कर देना चाहिए था जो 3 तारीख को प्रकाशित हो जाता। तीन तारीख को खंडन कर देना चाहिए था जो चार तारीख में प्रकाशित हो जात। तीन तारीख को खंडन कर देने चाहिए था जो चार तारीख को प्रकाशित हो जात लेकिन हमारे गृह मंत्री जी ने खंडन नहीं किया और यहां 4 तारीख को हाउस में आ गया। जाहिर है इसमें सच्चाई है।

और जो उन्होंने कहा है मुझे इसके ऊपर गम्भीर आरोप है। गम्भीर आरोप इस वजह से नहीं कि कोई मामूली आदमी है मैं तो मामूली आदमी इस सदन के किसी भी सदस्य को नहीं मानता ये सब प्रतिष्ठित है लेकिन गृह मंत्री जी केन्द्रीय सरकार के आन्ध्र प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री को पृथक्वादी कहे उनको चीट कहे उनको पेटी-पोलिटिशन कहे इसकी मैं घोर निन्दा करता हूँ। पृथक्वादी किन शब्दों में? माना वह नागालैंड गये और नागालैंड में नागालैंड नेशनल डेमोक्रेटिक पार्टी के समर्थन में गये हरियाणा में लोक दल के समर्थन में गये। अगर उन्होंने अपनी पार्टी का नाम नेशनल रख दिया तो उसका इरादा यही है कि आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता वह भी सारे देश में बढ़ेगी। अन्ना डी० एम० के नेशनल पार्टी है वह भी आगे बढ़ेगी। एन० एन० डी० पी० की सरकार एक बार नागालैंड में बन चुकी है। उसके समर्थन में वह गये। हरियाणा में लोक दल के समर्थन में गये। यह मानते हैं कि नागालैंड और हरियाणा में तेलुगु देशम पार्टी की कोई यनित नहीं है लेकिन गये थे कांग्रेस को हराने के लिए। उनका मुख्य उद्देश्य था कांग्रेस को हराना। क्यों गये कांग्रेस को हराने? इसलिये गये कि यह कांग्रेस की सरकार सारे प्रदेशों की विपक्षी सरकारों को अस्थिर करने का प्रयास करती रही है।

श्री बट्टा सिंह : झूठ है।

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : कैसे करती रही है यह मैं बताना चाहता हूँ। सन् 1983 में आन्ध्र प्रदेश की जनता द्वारा चुनी हुई सरकार को गिराया गया। सन् 1984 में हमारे मित्र बैठे हैं मट्टू जी इनकी सरकार को गिराया गया। इनके साथ हम सारे के सारे ...

श्री राम चन्द्र विक्रम : (उत्तर प्रदेश) विन. गवर्नर की रिपोर्ट के आपने 9 राज्यों की सरकारों को गिराया था (व्यवधान)

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : आपकी तरफ से वह बोलने वाले हैं मैं अपनी तरफ से बोल रहा हूँ। आप क्यों बोल रहे हैं। वह जवाब दे देंगे (व्यवधान) हम सब उनके साथ राष्ट्रपति जी के यहाँ एतराज करने के लिए पहुँचे। वहाँ सरकार गिराई और मुख्य मंत्री बनाया शाह साहब को। शा. साहब की हिट्री का पहले भी इन्हें पता था और शाह साहब की हिट्री का अब भी इन्हें पता है। शायद गलती इस समय तसलीम करते हो। अगर गलती तसलीम नहीं करते तो नेशनल काँग्रेस से कैसे समझौता करते। नागालैंड में कांग्रेस सरकार को स्थिर करने के लिए हरियाणा में भी कांग्रेस सरकार को स्थिर करने के लिए वह वहाँ पहुँचे। रही यह बात कि वह पैसा लेकर गये तो आपकी भी यह नहीं कहना चाहिये। आप जैसा पैसा तो किसी के पास नहीं। आप क्यों कहते हैं? पैटी पोलिटिशन कहना चीट कहना पृथक्वादी कहना और किसी के लिए नहीं गृह मंत्री जी के लिए सर्वथा अशोभनीय है। मैं हृदय से इसको कंडम करना हूँ निन्दा करता हूँ।

सन् 1982 में गढ़वाल में त्रेमबरी नरपतन बहुपक्ष चुनाव लड़ रहे थे। मैं उस समय उनके साथ नहीं था लेकिन पाँच प्रदेशों के मुख्य मंत्री राजाव के, हिमाचल प्रदेश के, हरियाणा के, मध्य प्रदेश के, उत्तर प्रदेश के और न जाने किसे ही आपकी वहाँ पहुँचे। किसी एक पक्ष की बात नहीं कर रहा हूँ। लेकिन मुझे इस बात का अत्यन्त दुःख है कि इस प्रकार की बातें कही गई हैं। मुझे इस बात का प्रमत्तता है कि माननीय गृह मंत्री जी ने मार्क्सिस्ट पार्टी के बारे में कहा है कि सी. पी. एम. सिद्धान्तों की पार्टी है, किन्तु पैटी पोलिटिगियन्स को स्पोर्ट करती है। यह तो खुशी की बात है कि अपने उनकी तारीफ की है। उनका दिमग साफ है, वे सिद्धान्तों के अनुसार चलते हैं। लेकिन बम्बई और त्रिपुरा में तो मार्क्सिस्ट पार्टी की सरकार है, आप

उनका विरोध किस वजह से करते हैं ? अगर मार्कसिस्ट सिद्धान्तों की आप तारीफ करते हैं तो उनकी सरकार का विरोध क्यों करते हैं ?

श्री साहू गुण आडवाणी : इनके एक मंत्री ने कहा था कि सी० पी० एम० की सरकार को बेश्कफ बंगाल में फेंक देंगे।

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : एक बात मैं और कहना चाहता हूँ। जो गोरखा नेशनल लिबरेशन फ्रन्ट है उसका आप समर्थन क्यों करते हैं ? यह बात उचित नहीं है।

श्री बूटा सिंह : इसका समर्थन नहीं कर रहे हैं.... (व्यवधान)।

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : श्रीमन्, अगर आप आज्ञा प्रदान करें तो मैं आपके माध्यम से यह भी प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि देश के गृह मंत्री सन् 1984 से पूर्व खुल्लमखुल्ला प्रदेश की सरकारों को स्थिर करने की कोशिश नहीं करते थे,

क्रीय सरकार भी खुले आम ऐसा प्रयास नहीं करती थी, लेकिन अब अगर विभिन्न प्रदेशों की सरकार को अस्थिर किया जाएगा, प्रदेश सरकारों को खुल्लमखुल्ला अस्थिर करने की कोशिश की जाएगी तो यह हमारे देश की एकता और अखण्डता और लोकतन्त्री प्रणाली के लिए खतरा होगा। आपको देश की एकता और अखण्डता को चुनौती देने के काम कभी नहीं करने चाहिए। इसलिए जब आपकी तरफ से इस प्रकार की बातें कही गईं तो मुझे अच्छा नहीं लगा। एक दफा नहीं, आपने चार दफा अधिकारियों को अपने भाषण में चेतावनी दी। आखिर निष्पक्ष चुनाव हो, यह सभी चाहते हैं। देश में निष्पक्ष चुनाव हो, यह सारे देश में डेमोक्रेसी के हित में है। इसकी हम सबको चेष्टा करनी चाहिए और आपको भी कनी चाहिए। अभी महारनपुर में लोक सभा का उप-चुनाव हुआ था, वह कितना निष्पक्ष हुआ है ? नामालूम में

चुनाव हुए, वे कितने निष्पक्ष हुए ? इसलिए मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि लोकतन्त्री प्रणाली की सफलता के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि हमारे देश में निष्पक्ष चुनाव हो, इसमें किसी का मतभेद नहीं हो सकता है।

श्री हरबेन्द्र सिंह हंसपास : (पंजाब) : हरियाणा में भी चुनाव हुए हैं। वहाँ की आप बात क्यों नहीं करते हैं ?

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : हमने चेंबरमैन महोदय से प्रार्थना की थी कि बूथ केप-चरिंग की जो शिकायत की गई है, शायद माननीय सदस्य श्री वसल और श्री मलिक की तरफ से की गई थी, उसके बारे में हमने कहा था कि हम डिस्कशन के लिए तैयार हैं.... (व्यवधान)

श्री बूटा सिंह : सी० पी० एम० ने भी की थी।

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : मैंने कहा था कि हम इस पर डिस्कशन के लिए तैयार हैं, आप इजाजत दीजिये। हरियाणा के इलेक्शन में जो बूथ केपचरिंग की शिकायत की गई थी, उसके बारे में हमने कहा था कि हम डिस्कशन के लिए तैयार हैं, आप इजाजत दीजिये.... (व्यवधान) लेकिन मैं यह कहता हूँ कि यदि आप इजाजत दें तो आपको भी डिस्कशन करने के लिये तैयार हैं। (व्यवधान) भजनलाल को भी डिस्कस करने के लिये तैयार हैं।

श्री हरबेन्द्र सिंह हंसपास : भजनलाल वहाँ नहीं थे। (व्यवधान)

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा : अगर अष्टाचार के मामले में डिस्कस करना चाहते हैं तो मैं सी बार यह मानता हूँ कि आप भजनलाल को डिस्कस कर लें फिर कुछ करने की जरूरत ही नहीं होगी।

मान्यवर, आखिर मैं आपके माध्यम से मैं गृह मंत्री जी से यह बात कहकर

बैठ जाना चाहता हूँ कि देश एक है, देश की एकता और अखंडता हमें और आप सभी को सबसे प्यारी है। जितना भी नुकसान हो चुका है देश को खंडित होने से और जो आगे करने का इरादा है वह देश का जानी दुश्मन है। मैं गृह मंत्री जी से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि स्टेट और सेक्टर के रिलेशंस सिद्धान्तों पर आधारित रहने चाहिए जिसमें केन्द्र और स्टेट्स आपस में सहभाव और प्रेम के साथ काम करते रहें और इस देश को आगे बढ़ाने में अपना योगदान दें। जिस प्रकार की अनर्मल बातें आंध्र प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री के खिलाफ बेवुनियाद तरीके से कही गई है उसे उनका कड़ा विरोधी हूँ। जिस दिन कोर्ट यह साबित कर देगा, मैं सबसे पहला इंसान हूँगा एक भ्रष्ट आदमी के खिलाफ, मैं भ्रष्टाचार का जानी दुश्मन हूँ, खड़ा हूँगा, उसका विरोध करूँगा। इसलिये मैं यह उम्मीद करता हूँ कि लोकतंत्र के हित में, देश की एकता और अखंडता के हित में और केन्द्र और राज्यों के रिलेशंस के हित में आप राज्यों में विपक्ष की सरकारों को अस्थिर करने की कोशिश बन्द करें। इसी में देश का हित है, इसी में जनता का हित है।

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise ...

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह (बिहार) : मंत्री जी क्या जवाब दे रहे हैं? (व्यवधान)

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री जगेश देसाई) : जवाब नहीं दे रहे हैं, इटर्वीन कर रहे हैं।

श्री राम अवधेश सिंह : प्वाइट आफ ऑर्डर। महोदय, खामकर गृह मंत्री, माननीय बट सिंह के खिलाफ ये सारी बातें हुई हैं, इसलिये उनको ही इस पर सफाई देनी चाहिए। सरकार के किसी और आदमी को इस पर नहीं बोलना चाहिए, केवल गृह मंत्री को ही इसका जवाब देना चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Hon. Minister can speak on the subject, and I have allowed him. He is intervening.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to intervene in this debate only to highlight certain aspects which, I think, have tended to be clouded and, if I may say, crowded out by the din and the noise which were generated during the last three days.

I went to Guntur a day prior to the Home Minister's visit to the district. One goes as a party worker. Buta Singhji is, I think, first and foremost a humble worker of the great party. Indian National Congress.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA : Say Congress-I. We do not accept you as the Congress. You are a usurper.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Upendrajji has the habit of accepting nothing on which the people have pronounced again and again. I went as a humble worker of the Congress ...

SHRI B. SATYNARANYAN REDDY: ... to destabilise.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: and I believe many other workers of the Congress went there. But if the Telugu Desam party is so fragile that it will be destabilised by five humble workers visiting Guntur, I can only be sorry for the Telugu Desam party.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You have seen in 1984. Don't forget that. (Interruptions) We know how to deal with you. That is a different matter.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I am not raising my voice. I am not shouting at them. Why do they get angry? (Interruptions)

Sir, I do not know whether you have visited Andhra Pradesh recently. Even if you had, I am sure you would not have had an opportunity to visit Guntur District. We arrive in Vijayawada and we have to drive about 200 kms....

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY:
Twenty kms.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I was thinking of Hyderabad. We arrive in Vijayawada and drive about 20 kms. When we enter Guntur, we are told that Neerukonda village is in this District and it is nearby. Memories crowd into our mind. One cannot banish from one's mind the horrible massacre that took place in Neerukonda. (*Interruptions*)

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY:
What about Bihar?

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Jungle law prevails in Bihar. (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Why do you interrupt the hon. Minister like this? I do not understand.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: An MLA of the Congress Party, Mr. Johnny... (*Interruptions*) I think, there is some problem in the seat in which he is sitting. I request you to allot him a seat somewhere else Mr. Johnny receives us and he narrates a story in which the motorcade of Shri Vengal Rao was attacked a couple of days ago, in which Mr. Johnny was also injured. One, therefore, listens to him, one forms opinions. (*Interruptions*) and one is affected by the fact that an MLA is attacked by certain people during the election campaign. One cannot brush that aside. One has to keep it in mind. Sir, another citizen of India, who, I believe, is a good Indian and a good Telegu, one Mr. Dronamraja Satyanarayan... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: He is a bigger*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It will not go on record.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Is he not a Telugu? Is he not an Indian? They are now using epithets against a person who is not in the House to defend himself?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: What have you been doing all along, for the last three days?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: He cannot use words like *. It is very easy for me to say that one recognises one's kith and kin Sir, we are told about the writ petitions filed by him. We are told about the proceedings in the High Court. We read about the arguments which were addressed in the Court and we know that a full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court has posted two writ petitions for hearing on the 15th December.

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: We have also read about the Chief Justice...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, there is really something wrong with him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Reddy, he is stating the fact about the posting of the writ petitions for hearing. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: There is something fundamentally wrong with him. We are speaking about the two writ petitions, being posted, find you, piecemeal for hearing on the 15th December after fixing definite deadlines for filing of a detailed counter-affidavit and reply and any documents. It is now—I would not say it is unprecedented—certainly a matter of moment that a full Bench of the Andhra Pradesh High Court should decide to hear considering the gravity of the issue raised before it, the two writ petitions on the 15th December. These are not things which we can brush aside. They are very much in our mind. These influence are thinking. These influence are speeches. These influence the words which we use. We go down and address meetings. I address meetings I have no hesitation in stating what I spoke at these meetings. You had no complaint against me earlier and I am

sure you will have no complaint now also. I said, five years ago, the people of Andhra Pradesh voted for Shri N. T. Rama Rao because he promised a different kind of Government. I spoke in English, I was translated into Telugu (*Interruptions*): Yes, I said, of course, it is a different kind of Government. The Congress Party for several years gave you a party government, but here is a Government which is giving you a family government, government of one family. (*Interruptions*) Of course, some people would have accepted what I said and some would not have accepted.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: What about your Congress(I) Government? Is it not a hierarchy Government? How has Mr. Rajiv Gandhi come?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: You say it several times. So the point is, I am addressing an election meeting. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Upendra and I have not formed a mutual administration society for singing the praises of Shri N. T. Rama Rao. I am addressing an election meeting and there the words uttered are conditioned by the fact that the Guntur Zila Parishad elections are being held under the shadow of corruption charges levelled against NTR by a citizen of India in the Andhra Pradesh High Court. They are indelible facts. (*Interruptions*) It is really unfortunate. What is wrong with him? What is wrong with your party colleague, Mr. Upendra?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You go on.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: On a point of order. (*Interruptions*). Kindly ask him to take his seat. I am on a point of order.

मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। जो इश्यू है वह यह नहीं है कि चिदम्बरम जी ने जाकर चुनाव सभा में क्या भाषण किया... (*व्यवधान*)... हमारी बात सुन लीजिये।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He is perfectly

right. What they are saying is within their right.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: What they are saying is right. We were also saying during Haryana elections...

श्रीमती रेणुका चौधरी लोग क्या कह रहे हैं वह हम सुना रहे हैं...

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय : मेरा निवेदन यह है कि चिदम्बरम जी ने वहां चुनाव सभा में क्या कहा यह इश्यू नहीं है... (*व्यवधान*)... मेरा निवेदन यह है कि इश्यू यह है कि श्री बूटा सिंह जी ने अपने भाषण में वहां पर क्या कहा। लेकिन मिस्टर चिदम्बरम ने अपने भाषण में वहां क्या कहा यह इश्यू नहीं है और न यह गूटूर... (*व्यवधान*)... का प्रश्न है। मेरा निवेदन है कि बूटा सिंह जी ने जो कहा उसको डिफेंड करने के लिये वे कहें लेकिन क्या उन्होंने वहां पर भाषण दिया है, उसकी कोई रिलेवेंसी यहां नहीं है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He is also talking of election. He also had gone there.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Whatever he is saying, there is no validity in that. In my special mention I did not say anything as to what Shri P. Chidambaram said.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I am only making a preamble to what I have to say. Mr. Upendra, I have to build up my argument. I did not say that Mr. Upendra criticised me. Listen to the debate. Ask your colleague to sit down. It is a debate and let us understand that it is a debate (*Interruptions*). Will you allow me to speak? This is a debate, they should understand that. I had gone to address the Guntur Zila Parishad election. I have addressed...

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: In that case I also went to the Guntur Zila Parishad elections, I also addressed meetings. Would you allow me to speak?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please sit down. (Interruptions). I will allow you. When Mr. Virendra Verma was talking about Kashmir and other places, I did not say that he cannot speak all that (Interruptions). I have given my ruling and I allow him to speak.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: No, don't allow him to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I have allowed him. I have given my ruling.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: With all respect to our far more senior Members, they should understand how a point is debated. I am debating a point. A person who goes to an election campaign cannot brush aside or close his eyes to the fact that the Guntur Zila Parishad election was fought under the shadow of grave charges, levelled against Mr. N T. Rama Rao by a citizen of India and a resident of Andhra Pradesh in the Andhra Pradesh High Court. That is a fact; it cannot be wished away. It is a fact. (Interruptions). What is wrong with my elderly friend? What is wrong with him today? You cannot wish away the fact.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Have some patience. If the Minister does not speak to the point, I will stop him. But I feel he is making an argument. (Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: It is an argument. Please understand this. Please ask him to bear with me for five minutes. (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): This whole issue is on the Guntur election.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: It is an election. It is an unfortunate fact but it is a fact. It is unfortunate for the Telugu Desam Party I say this with considerable sympathy for them. They were fighting an election. (Interruptions) They were fighting an election under the grave handicap imposed by the two judgments (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He is not yielding. (Interruptions)

SHRI BUTA SINGH: Why are you bothered about these things?

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: She is sorry he did not spend more time there.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: If the hon. Member has exhausted her lung power, we can collectively exercise our brain power. . . . I sympathise with them. They were fighting an election. . . . There is no way to make me sit down until I finish my speech. And don't even try to. . . . They were fighting an election under a considerable handicap. The handicap was an acquired handicap, handicap which was acquired by, according to me, five years of misrule. That is the handicap which they acquired. When you fight under such a handicap. (Interruptions)

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: As you fought an election in Haryana under the shadow of Bofors

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Naturally when they fight an election. . . .

श्रीमती रेणुका चौधरी : चालीस साल में कांग्रेस का क्या निशान नंगा भूखा हिन्दुस्तान ।

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Naturally when they fight an election under such a handicap, naturally when a party . . . (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): You cannot interrupt like this on every sentence.

This is very unfair. If you do like that I will order it not to go on record.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, when they fight an election.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Chandika

श्रीमती प्रतिभा सिंह (बिहार) : माननीय उपसभापति जी मैं केवल एक मिनट लेना चाहती हूँ। मैं बीच में कभी इंटरप्ट नहीं करना चाहती हूँ। श्रीमती रेणुका जी ने की इस बात पर कि चालीस वर्ष में नंगा भूखा हिन्दुस्तान है मैं सिर्फ इसको कट्टाडिक्ट करना चाहती हूँ। मैं केवल यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि पांच साल में शायद एन टी. रामाराव ने आंध्र प्रदेश को भूखा, नंगा तो नहीं कर दिया किंगडॉम में एक मामूली चुनाव में हम जीत गये ?

श्रीमती रेणुका चौधरी : चूँकि हम रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान दे चुके हैं।

श्री मीर्जा इशदिबेग (गुजरात) : इस देश के लोगो ने स्लोगन तो यह भी लगाया था कि—

इस देश का नेतृ कैसा हो,
राजीव जैसा हो।

यह नारे भी लोगो ने लगाये थे। वह उनको सुनाई नहीं दिये। वह एक कान तो खुला रखती है और एक कान को बन्द रखती है।

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: When they fight an election... (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATRAJAN: Sir, I take serious exception to what the hon Member has said about a Member here..... You should expunge it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It is not on record (Interruptions) They are not on the record I have checked up.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, we are grateful to you that nothing

which honourable Member, Renukaji, says ever gets into the record... (Interruptions) ..

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: What grateful? . . . (Interruptions) It is on record. Otherwise ... (Interruptions) .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): What do you want?

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: The Member took serious exception to a remark which I made. It is on record.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I said it is not on the record (Interruptions) ..

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Otherwise she should apologize. . . (Interruptions)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): If you behave like this, I will have to ... (Interruptions) . I am on my legs. I have checked up and it is not on the record... (Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, the total electorate in the Guntur Zila Parishad is 20,76,283. Naturally, Sir, a party which is the ruling party in the State, cannot afford to lose an election involving so many voters. In fact, if I may make a very simple comparison, the electorate is three times the size of Nagaland's which is last state which went to election and, if Mr. Rama Rao in his wisdom thought it fit to go to Nagaland and woo six lakhs of voters in an election in which he had no stake one is entitled, to expect that he, very naturally is concerned about wooing an electorate of 20,76,283. But in his anxiety to woo 20,76,283 voters, by certain actions which his party took, by a certain conduct, by certain signals which went out to the people—certain people went to Guntur and camped there—certain messages were silently and subtly spread among the electorate. I was told, and the Home Minister in my discussions with him told me

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

that he was told, by a large number of people, rightly or wrongly, that in their perception they feared that the elections may not be free or fair. This is a perception which people had.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Oh, I see!

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: We are glad she can see. (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Certain uncertain. (Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: May I congratulate on the fact Renukaji that she can see?

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: It is amazing that in his great wisdom nobody is prone to certain perceptions, certain this, certain that--full of uncertainties. के जो बों क तो नही।

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI: Please don't talk like an. (Interruptions) ...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, how can one close one's ears and shut one's eyes to what people come and tell him, to what people come and explain to him?

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: People without vision.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: For example, Sir, can I ignore the fact that, while charges were levelled by this side against Mr. N.T. Rama Rao and when they were vigorously rebutted, the honourable Member, Mr. Vajpayee, who sat there with his usual beatific smile, did not defend them? Can I ignore that? I can't.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He is a very sober man.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, can I ignore the fact that although the Lok Dal (B) owes a great debt of gratitude to Mr. N.T. Rama Rao for campaigning

for them in the Haryana elections, Mr. Virendra Verma said "I do not support N.T. Rama Rao?"

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: He did not say that. (Interruptions)...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Of course he said it--"I do not support all that N.T. Rama Rao did."

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: A point of clarification I can understand, the Minister does not know enough of Hindi. What he said at the end was, "if the High Court ultimately upholds these charges, and if he is proved corrupt, I will be the first man to oppose him."

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I heard the translation that way. All right. That is a minor point.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Please give your ruling.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: If it is not there, it is not there. I withdraw that portion. Sir, how can I ignore the fact that with all his eloquence in defending and upholding the Centre-State relations, Mr. Dipen Ghosh did not defend Mr. NTR? How can I ignore the fact? I cannot. These are the facts which stare at you. Therefore, when you go to Guntur, these are the facts which stare at you. People tell you about Neerukunda. People tell you about the High Court writ petition. People tell you about Karamchedu. People tell you about free and fair elections. People tell you about the pressures that are sought to be put. People tell you about the State Home Minister. We are now talking about the Union Home Minister. People tell you about the Home Minister who belongs to the district, camping there for ten days. Nothing right or nothing wrong. I am not questioning his constitutional right to do that. People tell you about that. In that context, we make election speeches.

Sir, I think, we must recognise that there are two kinds of truth in India to day: One is the gospel truth, and the other is the gossip truth. Which truth do you want to believe? You have read out

a statement from the "NEWSTIME". You have not yet allowed—may be because of the constraints of the debate—you have not allowed the Home Minister to stand up

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:

I take serious objection. Did the Home Minister try to clarify for the last three days in which we are having the debate? Did he once get up and try to clarify?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The Home Minister said, "I will clarify at the time of my speech."

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:

I have repeatedly requested him to clarify to end this controversy, but he was sitting silent

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I am not interested in your interruptions. I am not taking note of your interruptions. I will not take note of your interruptions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I have made it very clear that the Minister said, "I will clarify at the time of my speech only."

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: May be because of the rules of the debate, may be because of the constraints of the debate, maybe because of the way the debate has developed, maybe because of the ground rules we have laid down, the Home Minister has not yet said what he had said at Guntur. I am not blaming you for that. I am making a statement of fact. When he will reply, I am sure, he will say what he has said. Until then, one, I think, while criticising *(Interruptions)*

Sir, I have told my learned friend that I was not going to take note of his interruptions. Why should he interrupt? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: I did not say anything against you. You need not clarify anything. Did we say anything about your speech? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I am defending like every one else.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: May I request him to be slightly fair? When he says that Mr. Dipen Ghosh has not given defence of Mr. NTR—I belong to his party—the point is, the issue was not defence of Mr. NTR. He said that he was describing a situation. Absolutely right. But in describing a situation, one might say that Mr. Dipen Ghosh has not defended Mr. Rajiv Gandhi. But they are not the issues. I accept his debating skill. May I, through you, request him to go above the school boys' level? It is not a college debate.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA:

We are discussing Mr. Buta Singh's statements. Where is the question of defending Mr. NTR? We do not want anybody to defend Mr. NTR. We can defend him ourselves.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: My appeal is, while you are entitled to criticise on the basis of the newspaper report, you must suspend judgement because you must allow the hon. Home Minister to say what he had said. And if he says that these are the words he had said, they can be the basis of a final pronouncement *(Interruptions)*. The rules of the debate are that the Minister is going to reply at the end. We have agreed to a full debate. We are not wasting time. You have wasted enough time, and I am wasting the same amount of time!

SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY: Why are you wasting the time?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Because you have wasted the time, I am entitled to waste an equal amount of time.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA alias V. ARUNACHALAM (Tamil Nadu) Is this House for wasting the time?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: It is not only Mr. Dipen Ghosh on whose behalf Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee took up cudgels, who has declined to defend Mr. Ramu Rao. Mr. Jyoti Basu also, when asked to comment on the various corruption

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

charges said: "I do not know much about it. "Mr. Basu said he did not know specific cases against Mr. Rama Rao," but Mr. Buta Singh told him of two allegations. One is regarding Income-tax evasion and the other about land dealings." Asked to comment on inquiry ordered by Mr. Rama Rao into corruption charges, Mr. Basu quipped, "this is news to me." Unless he has specific charges against leaders who ruled during the last 50 many years, the probe appears to be fantastic." Therefore, Sir, people will comment, people will say things.

SHRI NIRMAL CHATTERJEE: Why don't you quote him about Rajiv Gandhi also?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, people will say things, because it is the essence of democracy.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: One minute, Mr. Vice Chairman. So long I was silent and was listening to Mr. Chidambaram's college-boyish debate because I knew how he had come to this Parliament and how he got the right to speak here. Had there not been shadow of AIADMK over him, he would not have come here. So, naturally I did not want to interrupt him because he is under the shadow of the AIADMK. However, when he referred to my speech on Friday on a point of submission I had clarified, as my colleague Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee has clarified. When he refers to Mr. Jyoti Basu's remarks about NTR, will he kindly read that remark in the background of Jyoti Basu's of repeated remarks about Rajiv Gandhi being the fountainhead of all corruption?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, the point is that this is the essence of democracy. People will comment, people will criticise, people will indulge in a little rhetoric, people will appeal to voters to see their point. That is the essence of democracy and the essence of debate. One cannot become hyper-sensitive to this debate and this kind of rhetoric in an election. This is all that I wish to say. But then one or two things happened in

the course of the last two or three days of the debate which I desire to clarify, because we have been called by newspapers, friendly to them, as barrackers.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: The "Times of India" is friendly to us?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I did not say any name. I said a newspaper friendly to you has characterised us as barrackers. Another newspaper has said that Buta Singh Ji's colleagues, notably I, had made a falsification.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Correct.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, I want to answer this charge of falsification because I have the ruling of the Chairman who was sitting on the Chair that day. This is about the judgment. Let me read that portion of the record to establish who was making perhaps an unwitting error and who was saying what is correct.

Mr. Upendra said and I will only quote that one sentence

"The High Court has not passed any judgment so far, the petition is pending before them" etc...

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Please read the whole thing. Don't take one sentence out of context.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: If he wants me to read the whole thing, I will read the whole thing. Referring to Buta Singh Ji, Mr. Upendra said:

"He is highly misinformed. The hon. High Court of Andhra Pradesh has not passed any judgment so far. The petition is pending before them. Even when the Prime Minister was asked during his recent visit to Hyderabad, he said: 'the matter is *sub-judice*; I will not comment.' But by bringing the High Court into the picture, by ascribing all his remarks to the High Court, he has not only committed a contempt of the High Court, but was also indirectly trying to influence a judicial decision. That is my charge against him."

I interjected and said: about his sentence that the hon. High Court of Andhra Pradesh has not passed any judgement so far—judgment—in the singular—the petition is pending before them, petition in the singular, I, said “ I am sorry, Madam, I would not normally interrupt him. He has shown the courtesy of saying that he has no grievance against me. But I want to point out one thing. He is not correct when he says that there is no judgement of the High Court. Four Writ Petitions were filed. Two Writ Petitions were admitted and have been posted for final hearing on the 15th December. In the other two cases Madam, orders have been pronounced by a Full Bench. And an order pronounced by a Full Bench of the High Court is a judgment. We are entitled to quote from the judgment. We are entitled to refer to the judgement. Therefore, it is incorrect to say that there are no judgements of the Andhra Pradesh High Court. There are two judgements of the Andhra Pradesh High Court, one delivered by the Chief Justice and one delivered by Justice Anjaneyulu.” Sir, I am not charging that Mr Upendra has made a falsification. He may have been genuinely advised that the order pronounced by the Full Bench dismissing two Writ Petitions at the admission stage does not amount to a judgement. You may have been advised so. I do not believe Mr. Upendra is a lawyer. Some lawyer friends may have advised him so. I am not charging him with any falsification. But equally, Sir, I cannot be charged with falsification. There are two judgements of the Andhra Pradesh High Court. Nobody can falsify anything. I am not saying you are charging. (Interruptions)

SHRI PARVATHANTENI UPENDRA: I am on a point of order. The Minister is entitled to give his clarification if anything has been said in this House in the course of the debate. But he cannot answer to what newspapers have written. (Interruptions) Why should he answer to these things?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Sir, I am not charging anyone with anything. I am only saying that we on this side have been advised like they have been advised. We think they have been advised wrongly. They think we have been advised wrongly. That is again the essence of debate. We have been correctly advised that there are two judgements of the Andhra Pradesh High Court dismissing two Writ Petitions at the admission stage but those are nevertheless judgements. In two other matters the matter is pending. (Interruptions) A lot of argument was on as to what is the judgement of Andhra Pradesh High Court.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Just one minute. I want to know from the learned Minister because I am not a lawyer, I am a layman, he is an eminent lawyer and a Minister now. In the two judgements which he says let us call these judgements because whatever the court says is judgement, I agree to what he says ...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Thank God he is agreeing.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: There are two things. The court's finding on the charges and the court rejecting the prayer of the petition passing an Order is something in the operative part because the charges are same in all the four petitions. The charges are not different. If the charges are different, I would have taken it that they have given their final judgement. But in the remaining two petitions also they have included the same charges which are still pending. They are *sub-judice*. Therefore, he cannot say that they have already passed the judgement. That is my point.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Mr. Upendrajai kindly go through the record very carefully. When I stood up to make my brief interventions, I did not use the word 'finding'. I did not use the word 'operative part'. I repeatedly said that there are two judgements of the Andhra Pradesh High Court.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Whether it is a judgement or allegation, that is more important.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: What is a judgement? I will explain it to you (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Mr. Upendra has made one point. He said that four Writ Petitions were filed on the same ground and allegations are the same.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I am coming to that. There are four Writ petitions because the four prayers before the court asked for four reliefs. In respect of two reliefs, the Writ Petitions were dismissed. One was a writ of *quo warranto*. (*Interruptions*) That is what I am trying to say. They were not admitted. One was a writ of *quo warranto* which was dismissed. One prayed for a writ of *mandamus* directing the Central Government to impose President's rule and that was also dismissed. The four petitions were supported by a common affidavit, a common affidavit running into about 180 pages, containing a large number of allegations. I think you will concede that I know enough law not to mistake an allegation for a "finding". Allegation is very different from a finding and please go through my record to find out if I have ever stood up and said that an allegation is a finding. I have not used the word "finding". I have not used the word 'operative part'. (*Interruption*). I am not yielding to Mr. Nirmal Chatterjee. Sir, I am not yielding to him. You must allow me to complete a paragraph. I have never used the words "finding" and "operative part". But there were a lot of arguments as to what is the operative part. Mr. Upendra and his colleagues think that the word 'dismissed' is the operative part. With great respect, in my view, it is not the operative part. Take one writ petition. I will not go into the other writ petition.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: They have made some comments yesterday also. I myself read it out.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: The point is, let us start with one writ petition, the writ petition where the prayer was to impose President's Rule. Now the writ petition was opposed with a brief counter affidavit. Again Mr. Upendra is wrong in saying that no counter affidavit was filed. A brief counter affidavit was indeed filed. I agree a detailed counter affidavit traversing the allegations was not filed and perhaps Mr. Rama Rao was not obliged to file that counter affidavit at that stage I concede the point. But he did file a brief counter affidavit taking certain jurisdictional objections, objections to jurisdiction. But he took two objections to jurisdiction and, on each objection, the High Court gave a finding. Each finding is indeed a finding and not an allegation. On each objection, the High Court gave a finding. The first objection was on *locus standi*. The objection was that Mr. Dronam Raju Satyanarana did not have the *locus standi* to file this writ petition. The second objection was, assuming he had the *locus standi*, this prayer cannot be granted by the High Court. Now what did the full bench say? Please bear with me. The full bench rejected the first objection of *locus standi* but upheld the second objection that the relief, as prayed for, to issue a *Mandamus*, to the Central Government would not lie. On both, there are findings. Both findings must be read. We are entitled to rely upon both findings. Since Mr. Upendra and his colleagues were labouring under the misapprehension that it is only the finding on the second issue, namely, writ of *Mandamus* will not issue, I want to take this opportunity to read the finding, the finding of the High Court on the first issue because it is a finding given by the High Court—I want to read only that portion I quote:—

"The question for consideration is whether the petitioner can be thrown off the portals of this Court for the above reasons. If the allegations contained in the writ petition are vague, unsubstantial, political, in character and roving in nature,

it might lend sufficient justification for the Court not to entertain the petition."

This is the finding—We have therefore, critically looked into the various contentions raised in the writ petition. Whether or not true, several of the allegations are grave. It is alleged that the first respondent secured exemption, under the Urban Ceilings Regulation Act contrary to the provisions of that Act by using his official position as Chief Minister. Several documents in support of these allegations were filed. Allegations were made that the first respondent secured for himself and his relations exemptions from the levy of entertainment tax on wholly untenable grounds, clearly violating the provisions of the Entertainment Tax Act. There are allegations that enormous public funds were spent on properties belonging to the first respondent and his relations. A large number of Government Order were filed to fortify this plea.

I will not read the rest of the paragraph but I will come to the end of the paragraph.

The above allegations which are merely illustrative and not exhaustive, give an account of some of the serious allegations made against the first respondent. It is not possible to know at this stage whether these allegations are true or not, because the first respondent in the affidavit filed by him did not choose to deny the allegations. He only characterized them as "frivolous, scandalous and ill-merited." The counter-affidavit must have been drafted by expert legal advisers of the first respondent and it is not as if the first respondent omitted to deny these allegations by accident. As matters stand, we have to take it that the first respondent did not advisedly choose to deny the allegations made against him. May be if a counter is filed by him after the

admission of the writ petition something may be said about these allegations, but just now we are not in a position to throw out the allegations contained in the affidavit as of no consequence. In our opinion a writ petition containing serious allegations touching upon matters of great public importance cannot be thrown out on the short ground that it is filed by a political rival and for political considerations. The best course, as suggested by the learned Attorney General, is to look into the allegations critically and if this Court is impressed that the allegations are serious in character and stand uncontroverted at the present time, the *locus standi* of the petitioner may not be open to question at this stage. Having looked into the allegations, we are *prima facie* satisfied that this writ petition is not liable to be thrown off on the ground of *locus standi*.

I am entitled to read this finding. (Interruptions) Why were you hopping mad when I started reading this paragraph? Today, the elections are over. Much of the heat should have died down. The people have delivered their verdict.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: You have retained your seat with a reduced majority and we got 1.5 per cent more votes.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I am coming to the arithmetic. (Interruptions)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: A party on this side has won by helping you to win.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: It is the CPI which has helped you. (Interruptions)

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: In fact, Sir, I have a grievance against the Home Minister. My grievance against the Home Minister is that apparently, when he went there, spoke to the people and tried to instil confidence in them, and said that they should come

[Shri P. Chidambaram]

out and vote fearlessly and when he appealed to the district administration that they must ensure a free and fair poll, perhaps because he went there at the last moment, he could not instil enough confidence in the people so that a large number of people could come and vote. (*Interruptions*). I am finishing in two minutes.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: The very fact that you had won this seat earlier and won again in spite of the tension, in fact, shows the impartiality of the State administration.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Thank you, Mr. Upendraji. He could not instil enough confidence. Last time, the total valid votes polled were 13,97,924 and in this election, despite the fact that it was a by election and so much concentration was there in this election, only 12,39,210 votes were polled. What does it mean? I am entitled to draw the political inference that it means that people, the weaker sections, the Harijans and backward classes, did not have the confidence to come and vote in this election. Had they voted, we would have won with an even larger margin. (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding. (*Interruptions*) I have to complete in one minute. (*Interruptions*) Last time, the Congress polled 48.9 per cent of the valid votes in the general election where the entire attention of the Telugu Desam party, as the ruling party, was divided over several zila parishads—I think, about 20, 25 zila parishads. This time, 12 Ministers came led by the Home Minister and the Chaitanya Ratham was rolling across the streets of the Guntur Zila Parishad for three days and the Congress polled 49.2 per cent of the votes. It shows that the margin has gone up.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Quote the Telugu Desam figures also.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Now, Sir, I am going to complete. The Telugu Desam also increased its margin from 45.8 to 47.3. Therefore, I

am willing to give a consolation tea-party at 6 O' clock to Mr. Upendra.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: He has increased by 0.2 We have increased by 1.52.

6 00 P.M.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Then what happened on the 1st, 2nd and 3rd of December, the House must know.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: Now it is 6 o'clock. We should start the half-an-hour discussion on Bofors

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I will take only one minute and I will finish.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): But it is 6 O'clock and at 6 O' clock there is listed a half-an-hour discussion on Bofors.

SHRI SATYA PRAKASH MALAVIYA: We should discuss Bofors now.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: If I am allowed to finish now, I will take only one minute. If I have to continue tomorrow, I might take ten minutes tomorrow. If Jaswant Singhji alone joins the others in the consensus, then I can finish in just one minute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): It is for the House to permit him to finish now; otherwise, he will continue tomorrow.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Only one minute and I have done.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: Let him finish in one minute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, let him complete now itself.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: On the 2nd of December, the day prior to the poll, just as we feared, there was a clash in Mutlur of Tenali Division where 15 persons were injured and the police had to fire rubber bullets to disperse the crowds. Four of the injured were admitted to the hospital. On the polling day there was obstruction of voters belonging to weaker sections and the Congress-I polling

agent was kidnapped. In Sattenapalli Mandal there were clashes . . . (Interruptions) . . . and fifteen persons were injured and polling was postponed. TDP supporters set fire to the house of a Congress-I worker. These are matters which we anticipated and feared, but despite the reign of terror which was sought to be unleashed, the Congress won the election and I think Mr. Upendra would do a service to his leader and his party gracefully accepting the verdict. . .

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA. We have already said that we accepted the verdict. The Chief Minister also issued a statement accepting the verdict. You need not tell us.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: . . . by accepting the spirit of democracy, by accepting the spirit of debate. Don't make a mountain of a molehill. You must imbibe the spirit of democracy, you must imbibe the spirit of debate, and that is the lesson of this debate.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION ON POINTS ARISING OUT OF THE ANSWER GIVEN IN THE RAJYA SABHA ON THE 1ST DECEMBER, 1987 TO STARRED QUESTION 342, REGARDING COUNTER-TRADE AGREEMENT WITH BOFORS

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I would request Members to ask pointed questions and not make speeches.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I have not even started. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I am making this request to all the Members.

डा. रत्नाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : श्रीमन्, बोफोर्स पर आलरेडी संसदीय समिति बैठी हुई है इसलिये जब तक उसकी फाइलिंग नहीं आ जाती है, तब तक उस पर बहस नहीं होनी चाहिए।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): This has been allowed by the Chairman. You can speak, Mr. Dipen Ghosh.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH. Mr. Vice-Chairman, when, along with my other colleague, I had raised certain questions under Starred Question 342 of 1st December, though about forty minutes were spent in replying to all the supplementaries, we found that many more questions still remained unanswered. So we wanted a full-fledged discussion on this issue. However, the Chairman has kindly consented to grant a half-an-hour discussion, and I must convey our thanks, through you, to the Chairman for giving me this opportunity to raise a half-an-hour discussion on this very important issue. It is because, Sir, of the fact that in reply to my question on the 1st of December 1987, Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha, who was replying on behalf of the Minister of Commerce, had stated:

"Counter-trade is a well accepted policy of the Government for promotion of exports from our country and we are importing a lot of things from all over the world and we want to use this bargaining position to promote our exports"

Sir, it is true that counter-trade is a well established policy of our country in promoting exports, in promoting the export trade of our country, against imports. But so far as my knowledge goes, till now India has counter-trade at least worth about Rs. 1,400 crores and of this amount, about one-third comes from M/s. Bofors alone. So, this seems to be very important and my learned friend on the other side, Mr. Ratnakar Pandey, did not know about what this Half-an-hour Discussion is on because the word 'Bofors' haunts them everywhere, . . . (Interruptions) . . . whether it is in connection with the arms deal or with counter-trade.

DR. G. VIJAYA MOHAN REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): My sympathies are with them;